

**THE EFFECT OF USING VIDEO TOWARDS STUDENTS'  
WRITING MOTIVATION AT THE SECOND YEAR  
OF STATE ISLAMIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL  
TEMBILAHAN INDRAGIRI HILIR  
REGENCY**



**BY**

**SAYID AGUSTIAN  
NIM. 10814002003**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1433 H/2012 M**

**THE EFFECT OF USING VIDEO TOWARDS STUDENTS'  
WRITING MOTIVATION AT THE SECOND YEAR  
OF STATE ISLAMIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL  
TEMBILAHAN INDRAGIRI HILIR  
REGENCY**

Thesis

Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for Getting Bachelor Degree of Education  
(S. Pd.)



**BY**

**SAYID AGUSTIAN**

**NIM. 10814002003**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1433 H/2012 M**

## **SUPERVISOR APPROVAL**

The thesis entitled “*The Effect of Using Video towards Students’ Writing Motivation at the Second Year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency*” is written by Sayid Agustian, NIM 10814002003. It is accepted and approved to be examined in the meeting of the final examination committee of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

Pekanbaru, Rajab 22, 1433 H  
June 13, 2012 M

Approved By

The Chairperson of the Department  
of English Education

Supervisor

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.

Drs. H. Kalayo Hasibuan, M.Ed-TESOL.

## EXAMINER APPROVAL

This thesis entitled “*The Effect of Using Video towards Students’ Writing Motivation at the Second Year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency*” is written by Sayid Agustian, NIM. 10814002003. It has been approved and examined by the final examination committee of undergraduate degree at Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau on July 3, 2012 M/Sya’ban 15, 1433 H as one of requirements for bachelor degree (S.Pd.) in English Education Department.

Pekanbaru, Sya’ban 15, 1433 H  
July 3, 2012 M

### Examination Committee

Chairman

Secretary

Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag.

Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd.

Examiner I

Examiner II

Drs. H. Sutarmo, M.Ag.

Rizky Amelia, M.Pd.

Dean  
Faculty of Education and Teacher Training

Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag.  
NIP. 19700222199703200

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT



In the name of Allah, the most gracious and the most graceful, praise belong to Allah the Almighty, the lord of universe. Though his guidance and his blessing, the researcher has completed the academic requirement for the award of bachelor degree at the Department of English Education, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University (UIN) Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

The title of this thesis is the effect of using video towards students' writing motivation at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency.

In this occasion, the researcher would like to express the great thanks to:

1. Prof. Dr. H M. Nazir, the Rector of State Islamic University Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
2. Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M. Ag, the Dean of Education and Teacher Training Faculty.
3. Dr. Hj. Zuhiddah, M. Pd, the Chairperson of English Education Department.
4. Drs. H. Kalayo Hasibuan, M. Ed. TESOL, as my supervisor who has contributed and guided me in accomplishment of this thesis.
5. All lecturers who have given their knowledge and information to the researcher through the meeting in the class or personally.
6. Drs. H. Aprizal, MM, as the head master of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency.
7. Nur'aviyah, S. Pd, as the supervising teacher as long as the researcher did the research at research location.
8. H. Sayyid Muhammad Syarief (Alm) and Hj. Zuriyah Latief, M. Ag, and also to my sisters and brother: Syarifah Rahmawati, S.E, Syarifah Fadhlina, S. Pdi, Sayid Qoriatul Akhmam, and Syarifah Suzi Lestari, for their understanding, support, love, and prayer.

9. My best friends, Semi Luxiana, S. Pd, Sri Hasfadila, S.Pd, Miftah Faridl, Rauf Tetuko Baruansyah, S.Pd, Ahmad Syarif, S.Pd, Enita Rahayu, S. Pd for giving me support in completing this thesis.
10. All my classmates in class G (2008), Siti Munawarah, Dinarti, Hayatun Husna, Suryati, Syafria D.M, Fitri Delvi, Gusnita, Arrohma, Ambar Sulistyaningsih, Eri Kurniawati, Siti Kumalasari, Endang Dwi Lestari, Marya Ulva, Asdi Andi, and Deni Irawan for every support and help that you always give me.
11. For all people who have given me the great support in conducting and completing this research. This cannot be written one by one.

Finally, the writer really realizes that there are still weaknesses on the thesis. Therefore, constructive critiques and suggestions are needed to improve this thesis.

May Allah the Almighty, the lord of universe bless you all. Amin.

Pekanbaru, June, 2012

The Writer

SayidAgustian

## **ABSTRAK**

**Sayid Agustian (2012)**

**Pengaruh Penggunaan Video terhadap Motivasi  
Menulis Siswa Kelas XI Madrasah Aliyah Negeri  
Tembilahan Kabupaten Indragiri Hilir**

Salah satu permasalahan dalam pembelajaran menulis adalah guru yang cenderung menggunakan metode and media pengajaran yang konvensional. Dikarenakan menulis merupakan aktifitas yang kompleks, sekiranya penting bagi guru untuk menggunakan media pembelajaran yang sesuai untuk pengajaran menulis yang memotivasi siswa untuk menghasilkan teks bahasa Inggris, termasuk teks narasi. Menggunakan video sekiranya dapat menjadi salah satu media yang menarik dalam pengajaran menulis teks narasi.

Studi ini dimaksudkan untuk mencari pengaruh penggunaan video dalam pengajaran menulis narasi dan mengidentifikasi motivasi siswa terhadap penggunaan video dalam kegiatan menulis mereka. Desain penelitian ini adalah eksperimen kuasi digunakan dalam studi ini dengan desain pre-test dan post-test non-equivalent group. Siswa kelas XI MAN Tembilahan diikutsertakan dalam studi ini. Sampel yang digunakan adalah dua kelas yaitu kelas eksperimen dengan 34 siswa dan kelas kontrol dengan 33 siswa.

Dari hasil penelitian, telah ditunjukkan bahwa video (video cerita narasi) efektif dalam meningkatkan motivasi menulis siswa sebagaimana ditunjukkan dalam analisa statistik dengan menggunakan t-Test dengan menjumlahkan peningkatan nilai yang didapat dari hasil pre-kuesioner dan post-kuesioner dari kedua kelas.

Kemudian, studi ini juga direkomendasi kepada guru mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris untuk menggunakan video sebagai media alternatif dalam pengajaran menulis teks narasi dengan pertimbangan kemungkinan menggunakan video di dalam kelas. Sebagai tambahan, untuk studi berikutnya, ada baiknya jika video juga digunakan dalam pengajaran jenis teks lainnya.

## THE LIST OF CONTENT

<b>SUPERVISOR APPROVAL</b> .....	i
<b>EXAMINER APPROVAL</b> .....	ii
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....	iii
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	v
<b>THE LIST OF CONTENT</b> .....	viii
<b>THE LIST OF TABLE</b> .....	x
<b>THE LIST OF APPENDICES</b> .....	xii
<b>CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
A. Background of the Problem .....	1
B. Definitions of the Terms .....	6
C. The Problem.....	8
1. Identification of the Problem.....	8
2. Limitation of the Problem .....	8
3. Formulation of the Problem .....	9
D. Objective and Significance of the Research .....	10
1. Objective of the Research .....	10
2. Significance of the Research .....	10
<b>CHAPTER II : REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b> .....	12
A. Theoretical Frame work.....	12
1. The Nature of Motivation.....	12
2. Students' Writing Motivation.....	16
3. The Factors Influencing Students' Writing Motivation .....	21
4. The Nature of Using Video .....	24
5. Using Video towards Students' Writing Motivation.....	28
B. Relevant Research .....	35
C. Operational Concept .....	36



1. Variable X .....	37
2. Variable Y .....	38
D. Assumption and Hypotheses.....	38
1. Assumption.....	38
2. Hypotheses .....	39
<b>CHAPTER III : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>40</b>
A. The Research Design .....	40
B. Location and Time of the Research .....	41
C. The Object and the Subject of the Research .....	41
D. The Population and the Sample of the Research .....	42
E. Data Collection Technique .....	43
1. Observation .....	43
2. Questionnaire .....	43
F. Data Analysis Technique .....	46
<b>CHAPTER IV :DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>49</b>
A. Data Description .....	49
B. Data Presentation .....	49
1. The Observation Data of Using Video in Teaching Narrative Writing.....	50
2. Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text .....	51
C. Data Analysis .....	97
1. The Using of Video in Teaching Writing.....	97
2. Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text .....	99
<b>CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS .....</b>	<b>112</b>
A. Conclusions.....	112
B. Suggestions .....	113
References .....	115
Appendices	

## THE LIST OF TABLE

Table III.1 : Difference between Control and Experimental Group .....	40
Table III.2 : The Population and the Sample of the Research .....	42
Table III.3 : The Recapitulation of the Research Instrument Validity.....	45
Table IV.1 : The Recapitulation of Observation Data on Experimental Class. .	50
Table IV.2 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 1 .....	52
Table IV.3 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 2 .....	53
Table IV.4 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 3 .....	55
Table IV.5 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 4 .....	57
Table IV.6 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 5 .....	58
Table IV.7 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 6 .....	60
Table IV.8 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 7 .....	61
Table IV.9 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 8 .....	63
Table IV.10 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 9 .....	65
Table IV.11 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 10 .....	66
Table IV.12 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 11 .....	68
Table IV.13 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 12 .....	69
Table IV.14 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 13 .....	71
Table IV.15 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 14 .....	73
Table IV.16 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 15 .....	75
Table IV.17 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 16 .....	77
Table IV.18 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 17 .....	78
Table IV.19 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 18 .....	80
Table IV.20 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 19 .....	82
Table IV.21 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 20 .....	84
Table IV.22 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 21 .....	85
Table IV.23 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 22 .....	87

Table IV.24 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 23 .....	89
Table IV.25 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 24 .....	91
Table IV.26 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 25 .....	93
Table IV.27 : The Result of Questionnaire Item 26 .....	95
Table IV.28: Percentage of Using Video in Teaching Narrative Writing.....	98
Table IV.29 : The Classification of Implementing Video in Teaching Narrative Writing.....	98
Table IV.30 : The Classification of Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text Score.....	99
Table IV.31 : The Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text before Using Video in Experimental Class .....	100
Table IV.32 : The Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text after Using Video in Experimental Class .....	102
Table IV.33 : The Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text in Pre-Questionnaire of Control Class.....	104
Table IV.34 : The Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text in Post-Questionnaire of Control Class .....	106
Table IV.35 : The Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text in Experimental Class and Control Class .....	108
Table IV.37 : Resume oft-Test.....	109

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### A. Background of the Problems

Motivation is one of the keys of success in learning process. Students can study well if they have the good motivation that encourages them. Motivation is very important because it can encourage and inspire the students to develop themselves. According to William and Burden in Harmer, motivation is a state of cognitive arousal which provokes a decision to act as a result of which there is sustained intellectual and/or physical effort so that the person can achieve some previously set goal<sup>1</sup>. In addition, Douglas as cited in Harmer stated that a cognitive view of motivation includes factors such as the need of exploration, activity, stimulation, new knowledge, and ego enhancement<sup>2</sup>. According to Wlodkowski and Ginsberg, Motivation is a concept with a romantic charisma. Like the stars, motivation offers inspiration as well as direction<sup>3</sup>.

Students must get difficulties to learn a foreign language if they have the low motivation because motivation is a significant factor in language learning. Based on the previous study of Dornyei in Qashoa, motivation is the main determinant of

---

<sup>1</sup> Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, (Cambridge: Longman, 2002), p. 51

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Raymond. J. Woldkowski and Margery B Ginsberg, *Teaching Intensive and Accelerated Courses* (San Fransisco: Jossey Bass, 2010), p. 14

second/ foreign language learning<sup>4</sup>. He also stated that going up and down, affecting language achievement and being affected by it<sup>5</sup>.

In English language learning, there are four main skills; they are reading, speaking, listening, and writing. Writing encourages thinking and learning for motivating communication and making thought available for reflection. When thought is written down, ideas can be examined, reconsidered, added to, rearranged, and changed. Referring to the nature of writing, Hughey, et. al, stated that writing is essential form of communication because through writing, we can express our feelings, hopes, dreams, and joy as well as our fears, angers, and frustrations<sup>6</sup>. Also, Bell and Burnaby in Nunan stated that writing is an extremely complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control of a number of variables simultaneously<sup>7</sup>. The similar idea is defined by Das in Mukminatein in Syafii in Syafii that writing is a process of generating language and communicating<sup>8</sup>.

Student's writing skill should be developed not only by students' ability in developing idea, mastering the vocabulary, using the correct grammar, and organizing the writing into coherent work, but also by students' motivation in writing. This is also a very important aspect of writing because writing is difficult enough to do, so the students need courage, motives, inspirations, interest, and willingness to do

---

<sup>4</sup>Sulaiman Hasan H. Qashoa, *Motivation Among Learner of English in the Secondary School in the Easter Cost of the UAE*, (Dubai: British University in Dubai, 2006). p. 2

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

<sup>6</sup>Jane B. Hughey, et al, *Teaching ESL Composition Principles and Techniques*. (Massachussetts: Newbury House Publisher, 1983), p. 33

<sup>7</sup>David Nunan, *Designing Task for Communicative Classroom*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 35

<sup>8</sup> M. Syafii S, *From Paragraph to a Research Report*. (Pekanbaru: LBSI, 2011), p.161

writing activity. According to Boscolo and Hidi, there are three main areas of motivation in relation with writing; they are motives (goal orientation, value, needs, and interest), students' perception of their ability in relation to difficulty to do the task, and students' effort to do several productive strategy<sup>9</sup>.

State Islamic Senior High School (MAN) Tembilahan is one of the senior high schools in Indragiri Hilir. As a formal school, this school also implies the English lesson to all the students. English teaching process at the second year takes four hours in a week (4 x 45 minutes) and the total period of English teaching is 29 meetings in a semester<sup>10</sup>. Therefore, the students can learn English maximally.

As a formal school, this school also implies the English lesson to all the students mainly, in EFL writing. According to School Based Curriculum (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan-KTSP) 2011, the purpose of learning English in State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan, especially writing, is "expressing the ideas in short functional texts and essays in the form of narrative, spoof, and hortatory exposition accurately, fluently and acceptably in daily life context and accessing the knowledge"<sup>11</sup>. In this research, the writer focused on the narrative text. In Addition, this school also implies the characterized curriculum so each skill in English stated in curriculum should be supported by students' characters and creative economy. In the syllabus, especially about writing skill, in the point of the creative economy, it states that the students should be Self Confidence (heart firmness, optimism), Task

---

<sup>9</sup>Suzanne Hidi, and Pietro Boscolo, *Writing and Motivation*, (Oxford: ELSEVIER, 2007), p. 2

<sup>10</sup>Nur'aviyah, S. Pd, *Silabus Bahasa Inggris KTSP MAN Tembilahan*, 2010/2011

<sup>11</sup>Ibid

Orientation (Motivated, patience, spirited, energetic), Taking risk (Loving challenge, ability to lead), Futuristic orientation ( having future perspective)<sup>12</sup>.

Ideally, based on the explanation above, the students should be self confident, motivated, energetic, spirited, and desired to do the writing activity; meaning that the students should be motivated to act as the result of their intellectual and physical effort to achieve the learning goal. However, Based on the writer's preliminary observation at the second year students of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan, it was clearly that some of the students had low motivation in learning English, especially in writing motivation. Their writing motivation was still so far from the expectation of the curriculum. This can be indicated as the following symptoms:

1. Some of the students did not pay attention to the teacher's explanation about writing material.
2. Some of the students left the class in writing session.
3. Some of the students always refused to do the writing assignments.
4. Some of the students did not do the writing task.
5. Some of the students always said that they could not write in English.
6. Some of the students cheated one another in writing session.

To resolve the problem, the teacher could use the various ways to fire up the students' writing motivation. It could be done by sharing the experience through

---

<sup>12</sup>Nur'aviyah, S. Pd , *SilabusBahasaInggris KTSP MAN Tembilahan*,2010/2011

some source materials or media; one of the effective media is using video. Video is one of functional teaching media. Using teaching media in the classroom is a good way to stimulate, interest, and motivate the students to learn. According to Ali in Hermadaliza, teaching media is a tool that can stimulate feeling, mind, attention, interest, and motivation to learn<sup>13</sup>. Further, Gagne and Briggs in Ali in Hermadaliza stated that media were important as tools to stimulate students to study<sup>14</sup>. Murcia in Hermadaliza found that media can do and enhance the language teaching and media assisting teacher in their job, bring outside the world into classroom and make the task of language learning more meaningful and exciting one<sup>15</sup>.

To choose the video as a teaching medium for writing is a good way in improving the students' basic language learning motivation, mainly writing motivation. According to Jack C. Richard and Willy A Ronandya, "to open up the classroom can be done by sharing experience-to topics to stimulate writing-the teacher to other material, such as videos, softwares, and books<sup>16</sup>. Also, in his article, Grant S. Wolf stated that using engaging and popular video materials was highly effective and eliciting creative, fluent and remarkably expressing writing from otherwise recalcitrant and unmotivated students<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup>Hermadaliza, *The Use of Audiovisual (VCD/DVD) to Increase Students' Interest in Learning English at the Second Year of MTs AL-WathanRupat*.(Pekanbaru: UIN SUSKA, 2009),p. 12

<sup>14</sup> Ibid

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 13

<sup>16</sup> Jack C. Richard, and Willy A. Renandya, *Methodology In Language Teaching*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.311

<sup>17</sup>Grant S. Wolf. "Using Video to Develop Writing Fluency in Low-Proficiency ESL Students, *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol.VII, no.8, (2006)



Based on the problem and the explanation exposed by the writer above, it was obvious that many students at that school had problems which should be solved as soon as possible. Either the problems were on the students or caused by other factors (writing difficulties itself). Therefore, the writer was interested in internalizing those problems in a research titled: **“The Effect of Using Video towards Students’ Writing Motivation at the Second Year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency”**.

## **B. Definition of the Terms**

### **1. Effect**

Effect may refer to a result or change of something<sup>18</sup>. In this research, effect refers to the effect of using video towards students’ motivation in writing narrative text at second semester of the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan.

### **2. Using Video**

Video is at best defined as the selection and sequence of messages in an audio-visual context<sup>19</sup>. In this research, the using video refers to the way of applying video to broadcast narrative material used as the treatment in the experimental class of the second year students of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan.

---

<sup>18</sup>Wikipedia, “Effect”, (15 march 2012)

<sup>19</sup>Christine Canning Wilson, “Practical Aspects of Using Video in the Foreign Language Classroom”, VI, (2000).

### 3. Writing

Writing is a transcription of the process of composing idea<sup>20</sup>. In this research, writing refers to student's activity of writing narrative text at second semester of the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan.

### 4. Narrative Text

Narrative text or narration is story writing<sup>21</sup>. In this research, narrative text refers to the type of the text that became the writing task given to the students of at the second semester of the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan.

### 5. Motivation

Motivation can be defined as a desire to achieve a goal combined with the energy to work toward the goal<sup>22</sup>. It points out on the students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second semester of the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan.

---

<sup>20</sup>Jane B. Hughey, et al, *Teaching ESL Composition Principles and Techniques*. (Massachusetts: Newbury House Publisher, 1983), p. 38.

<sup>21</sup>Alice Oshima, and Ann Hogue, *Introduction to Academic Writing (3rd Edition)*, (New York: Pearson Education, 2007), p. 24

<sup>22</sup>Sulaiman Hasan H. Qashoa, *Motivation Among Learner of English in the Secondary School in the Easter Cost of the UAE*, (Dubai: British University in Dubai, 2006). p. 1

## **C. The Problem**

### **1. Identification of the Problem**

Based on the symptoms stated above, the writer identifies the problems as follows:

- a. Why did some of the students not pay attention to the teacher's explanation about writing material?
- b. Why did some of the students leave the class in writing session.
- c. Why did some of the students always refuse to do the writing assignments.
- d. Why did some of the student not do the writing task.
- e. Why did some of the students always say that they could not write in English.
- f. Why did some of the students cheat one another in writing session.
- g. How is the students' writing motivation when they were taught by using video?
- h. How is the students' writing motivation when they were taught without using video?
- i. Is video effective to use as a teaching media in improving the students' writing motivation?

## **2. Limitation of the Problem**

There are many factors that influence students' writing motivation. In this case, the writer wanted to limit the problem because of the limited time, money, energy, and knowledge. Thus, the writer focused on the effect of using video towards students' writing motivation. In order to avoid misunderstanding in this research, the text used by the researcher is narrative text. In addition, the video used in this research is learning video about story.

## **3. Formulation of the Problem**

Based on the limitation of the problem above, this research problem was formulated as the following questions:

- a. How is students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency those who were taught by using video?
- b. How is students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency those who were taught without using video (Three-phase Technique)?
- c. Is there any significant effect of using video towards students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency?

## **D. Objective and Significance of the Research**

### **1. Objective of the Research**

Based on the research questions above, the objective of this research can be stated as follows:

- a. To get information about how students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency those who were taught by using video is.
- b. To get information about how students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency those who were taught without using video (Three-phase Technique) is.
- c. To get information if there is any significant effect of using video towards students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency.

### **2. Significance of the Research**

- a. To enlarge the writer's knowledge about the research, especially in the topic of student's motivation in writing narrative text.
- b. To give positive contribution to the students in improving their motivation in writing.

- c. To give positive contribution to the English teacher to develop the students' writing motivation.
- d. To give contribution in development of teaching and learning English theoretically of practically as a foreign language and for those who are concerned very much in the field of language teaching and learning.
- e. To add references for other next researchers having the same problem as the writer.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### A. Theoretical Framework

##### 1. The Nature of Motivation

The word *motivation* derives from the Latin *movere*, “to move,”. To a great extent, movement – physical activity as well as mental and social activity – defines the active process of writing<sup>1</sup>. Motivation is one of the keys of success in learning because motivation is a factor that encourages the learners taking action and being active in learning process. In the study of Kinder in Washoe, he found that motivation is psychological mechanisms governing the direction, intensity, and persistence of action not due to solely to individual difference in ability to overwhelming environmental demands that coerce the force action<sup>2</sup>.

According to William and Burden in Harmer, motivation is a state of cognitive arousal which provokes a decision to act as a result of which there is sustained intellectual and/or physical effort so that the person can achieve some previously set goal<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, according to Wlodkwoski, motivation is a concept with a romantic charisma; like a star, motivation offer inspiration as well as

---

<sup>1</sup>Suzanne Hidi, and Pietro Boscolo, *Writing and Motivation*, (Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), p. 17

<sup>2</sup>Sulaiman Hasan H. Qashoa, *Motivation among Learner of English in the Secondary School in the Easter Cost of the UAE*, (Dubai: British University in Dubai, 2006), p. 1

<sup>3</sup>Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, (Longman), p. 51

direction<sup>4</sup>. Meaning that motivation function as the pioneer or encourager for someone to do some actions in achieving the goal that he/she desired; thus, if the students want to achieve their goal in learning, they must have the motivation.

There are two types of motivation; they are intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. According to Harmer, **intrinsic motivation** comes from the individual. An intrinsic motivation motivates student to study because she/ he wants to study; the material is interesting, challenging, and rewarding and the student receives some kind of satisfaction from learning<sup>5</sup>. Thus, the students must be motivated by the enjoyment of learning process itself or by the desire to make themselves feel better in learning. In contrast, **extrinsic motivation** comes from any numbers of outside factors. An extrinsically motivated student studies and learns for other reasons<sup>6</sup>; for example the needs to pass the exam, the hope for financial reward, or the possibility of future travel<sup>7</sup>. Both of the motivations work together in learning process as the psychological mechanism that gives the students courage, energy, and attention in learning.

Both kinds of motivation have the very important roles in learning process. In other sides, those kinds of motivation can be divided into four aspects that motive the students' learning. First, *inclusion* means respect and connectedness. The students generally believe that they feel respected if they are connected in a group. In an

---

<sup>4</sup> Raymond. J. Woldkowski and Margery B Ginsberg, *Teaching Intensive and Accelerated Courses* (San Fransisco: Jossey Bass, 2010), p. 15

<sup>5</sup>William.T. Lile, "Motivation in the ESL Classroom", VIII, (2002).

<sup>6</sup> Ibid

<sup>7</sup> Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, (Cambridge: Longman, 2002). p. 51



atmosphere of respect, usually the intrinsic motivation emerges because the students are able to be authentic and accept responsibility for their action.

Second, *an attitude* is a combination of information, beliefs, values, and emotions that results in a learned tendency to respond favourably or unfavourably toward particular people, groups, ideas, events, or object. Attitudes strongly effect the behaviour and learning because they help use to know the world and direct they way to resolve it.

Third, *meaning* may be understood as an interpreting of information that gives greater clarity, such as when we say that the word “ shadow ” means“ the dark figure cast upon a surface by a body intercepting the rays from a source of light, ” or when we recognize our address in a listing. This kind of meaning involves facts, procedures, and behaviours.

Finally, *competence* includes *effectiveness* and *authenticity*. Socialization and culture largely determine what we think is worth accomplishing, what we value and want to do effectively. Authenticity is present when learning is connected to an adult’s actual life circumstances, frames of reference, and values. For example, an authentic assessment of learning would ask students to solve problems that have a parallel in the real world or their future work<sup>8</sup>.

In short, learning is motivated by how the learners themselves feel, believe, and behave toward the situation that they face in the learning process. Also, how the

---

<sup>8</sup>Raymond. J. Woldkowski and Margery B Ginsberg, *Teaching Intensive and Accelerated Courses* (San Fransisco: Jossey Bass, 2010), p. 24

learners interpret, value, and futuristically face the information about this world can motivate the learning process.

Learning motivation is a measureable variable. Commonly, measurements of language learning motivation are four conditions for motivation introduced by Keller. Keller's four conditions are: **Interest** (in the topic and activity), **Relevance** (to the students' lives), **Expectancy** (expectations of success and feelings of being in control) and **Satisfaction** (in the outcome)<sup>9</sup>.

According to Hidi and Boscolo, Students' motivation to write can be measured into three main areas of writing motivation that have been used as the measurement of writing motivation in some previous research, they are:

- a. *Motives*, it has two meanings: It can refer to something that moves a person to act in a particular way, or it can refer to the goal of the person's action<sup>10</sup>. It can be goal orientations, needs, values, interests which activate students' behavior.
- b. *Students' perception about their ability to write*, this area includes the students' self-efficacy, self-concept, and self-perception<sup>11</sup>.
- c. *Students' self-regulation to use productive strategies*, the strategies can be planning time, adopting metacognitive tools, and resisting the temptation of giving up writing<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup>Alvyda Liuliene, Regina Metienienė, "Second Language Learning Motivation", (2006), p. 95

<sup>10</sup>Suzanne Hidi, and Pietro Boscolo, *Writing and Motivation*, (Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), p. 30

<sup>11</sup>Ibid, p. 2

Motivation variable is something unobservable. Thus, it can be measured by using questionnaire. This questionnaire consists of some statements related to the students' motivation to write narrative text measured by using Likert Scale because the data is ordinal<sup>13</sup>. There are some steps to arrange the research instrument (questionnaire); it can be seen as follows:

- a. Identifying the variables in research title;
- b. Outlining the variables into sub variable;
- c. Finding indicators or aspects of each variable;
- d. Sorting the descriptors for every indicator;
- e. Formulating each descriptor into instrument items;
- f. Completing instrument with directions<sup>14</sup>.

## **2. Students' Writing Motivation**

Writing is one of language skills. Writing can be defined as the way of expressing ideas through written forms. Hughey, et.al, stated that writing is essential form of communication because through writing, we can express our feelings, hopes, dreams, and joy as well as our fears, angers, and frustrations<sup>15</sup>. Also, Bell and Burnaby in Nunan stated that writing is an extremely complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control of a number of variables

---

<sup>12</sup>Suzanne Hidi, and Pietro Boscolo, *Writing and Motivation*, (Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), p. 2

<sup>13</sup>SuharsimiArikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian; Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. (Jakarta: PT. Asdi Mahasatya. 2006), p. 58

<sup>14</sup>Riduwan, *Variable-variable Penelitian*, (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2005), p. 32

<sup>15</sup>Jane B. Hughey, et al, *Teaching ESL Composition Principles and Techniques*. (Massachussetts: Newbury House Publisher, 1983), p. 33

simultaneously<sup>16</sup>. The similar idea was defined by Das in Mukminatein in Syafii in Syafii that writing is a process of generating language and communicating<sup>17</sup>. In short, writing is a process of communication expressed with the complex cognitive activity to generate the language.

Writing can be viewed into two main aspects; they are writing as a process and writing as a product.

Nunan stated that there are two different views about nature of the writing; the first is product approach and the second is process approach. The product approach focuses on the end of the result of the act of composition and the process approach focuses on the means whereby the completed text was created as on the as the end of product itself<sup>18</sup>.

In addition, Flower in Hughey, et.al, said that writing is a problem solving a way of processing to attain goal<sup>19</sup>. Also, Comprone in Hughey, et.al, stated that writing is a transcription of the process of composing ideas; it is not the product of thought but it is actualization and dramatization<sup>20</sup>. Writing is the complex process because writing cannot be just mentioned as the written work but it is more about the process, procedure, and steps in resulting that written work.

Writing is a medium of communication. As what was stated before, by writing, a person can express his/her feeling that is called the way of communication.

---

<sup>16</sup>David Nunan, *Designing Task for Communicative Classroom*.(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 35

<sup>17</sup> M. Syafii S, *From Paragraph to a Research Report*. (Pekanbaru: LBSI, 2011), pp.161

<sup>18</sup>David Nunan, *Designing Task for Communicative Classroom*.(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p.36

<sup>19</sup>Jane B. Hughey, et al, *Teaching ESL Composition Principles and Techniques*. (Massachussetts: Newbury House Publisher, 1983), p. 38

<sup>20</sup> ibid

According to Peha, writing is the communication of content for a purpose to an audience<sup>21</sup>. In accordance of the theory, there are three key words; *content*, *purpose*, and *audience*. These mean that:

- a. Content (main idea + key detail). The content of a piece is what the writer wants to say. There are two parts of content: the *main idea*, the one of the most important thing the author wants you to know; and the *key detail*, the additional information that supports and explains the main idea.
- b. Purpose (think + do). The purpose of piece is why the writer wrote it. The writers want their readers to *think* something after they've finished reading. Sometimes, they want their readers to *do* something too.
- c. Audience (people + questions). The audience for a piece is who the writer writes to. The writer chooses the subject and the methods of presenting material according to who will read the finished product<sup>22</sup>. We always write to people. Sometimes it's a specific person, sometimes it's a group of people. And people always have questions they want you to answer. So, you can think of the audience as the *people* you are writing to and the *questions* they have about your topic.

Students must have difficulties to write in a foreign language if they have low motivation because motivation is a significant factor in language learning. Based

---

<sup>21</sup> Steve Peha, "The Writing Teacher's Strategy Guide", *Teaching That Makes Sense*, (1995-2010), p. 58

<sup>22</sup> Joy M. Reid, *The Process of Composition*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc, 1988), p. 2

on the previous study of Dornyei in Qashoa, motivation is the main determinant of second/ foreign language learning<sup>23</sup>. He also stated that going up and down, affecting language achievement and being affected by it<sup>24</sup>. Writing is one of the main skills in language learning, exactly writing needs motivation. Moreover, writing is a productive language skill in which the writer needs the psychological mechanism to produce the written language.

Referring to the nature of writing, Ghaith stated that “Writing is a complex process that allows writers to explore thoughts and ideas, and make them visible and concrete. Writing encourages thinking and learning for it motivates communication and makes thought available for reflection. When thought is written down, ideas can be examined, reconsidered, added to, rearranged, and changed<sup>25</sup>. Regarding the causes of student’s low motivation, Bettell, et.al, in Dakhal said that “... writing assumes a background knowledge that many readers don't have. Perhaps they don't read much. Or, again, they may concentrate so much on decoding difficult words and sentences that they can't bring their background knowledge to bear”<sup>26</sup>.

According to Hidi and Boscolo, the relation between students’ writing and motivation is that a useful way of organizing the variety of motivational constructs is by referring to the three main areas into which recent motivational research can be

---

<sup>23</sup>Sulaiman Hasan H. Qashoa, *Motivation Among Learner of English in the Secondary School in the Easter Cost of the UAE*, (Dubai: British University in Dubai, 2006), p. 2

<sup>24</sup> Ibid

<sup>25</sup>Rebat Kumar Dakhal, *Students Motivation Toward Creative Writing*, (Lalitpur: Katamandu, 2010), p. 10

<sup>26</sup> Ibid

divided, and considering how each area may be related to writing. The first area regards the motives – e.g., goal orientation (mastery vs. performance vs. avoidance goals), needs, values, interests – which activate a student’s behaviour. In relation to writing, it can be exemplified by a middle school student’s interest in exposing his/her ideas on a relevant topic in written form, or a novelist’s intention to narrate an involving story. In contrast, the novelist’s lack of motivation to write is probably different from a middle school student’s negative attitude toward the composition assigned by the teacher. However, in both cases the writers have an orientation to write, or not to write<sup>27</sup>.

A second area regards the writer’s perceptions of his/her ability to write in relation to the difficulty of the task and the resources of the context. Again, a novelist’s concern with critics’ comments and audience response to his/her work is probably different from a student’s concern with his/her teacher’s evaluation. Both writers, however, have positive or negative representations of themselves as writers. Such representations include self-efficacy, self-concept, and self-perceptions of competence<sup>28</sup>.

Finally, both professional and student writers, when dealing with a demanding task, try to manage it by using various, more or less productive strategies:

---

<sup>27</sup>Suzanne Hidi, and Pietro Boscolo, *Writing and Motivation*, (Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), p. 2

<sup>28</sup> Ibid

from planning time, to adopting metacognitive tools, to resisting the temptation of giving up writing<sup>29</sup>.

In writing, the students should be also motivated by their experience to inspire and produce what to write. Background knowledge, reading, audio visual record, and so forth are the experience captured by the students' mind as the experience to make the good writing.

### **3. The Factors Influencing Students' Writing Motivation**

The motivation that brings students to the task of learning English can be affected and influenced by the attitude of a number of people. Commonly, students' motivation in learning can be affected by the following factors:

- a. *The society we live in:* students' attitude is affected by their view about how important English is learned in society or at school.
- b. *Significant others:* the students' learning motivation is also affected by the people who are close to them.
- c. *The teacher:* it is obvious that the teacher has the most important role in language teaching and learning so students' attitude in learning is so much affected by teacher.
- d. *The method:* it is vital that both students and teacher have some confidence in the way of teaching and learning. If they lose the confidence, it can disastrously affect motivation<sup>30</sup>.

---

<sup>29</sup>Suzanne Hidi, and Pietro Boscolo, *Writing and Motivation*, (Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), p. 2



In short, students' motivation in language learning can be affected by their social life, the people around them, the teachers, and their confidence to use the way to learn.

Specifically, there are some factors influencing the students' writing motivation. They can be seen as follows:

- a. *Teacher*: The teacher's roles in classroom are motivating the student to write, creating the right condition for the generation of the ideas, persuading them of usefulness of the activity, and encouraging them to make as much effort as possible for maximum benefit<sup>31</sup>.
- b. *Topic attractiveness*: The interestingness of the learning themes or topics can influence students' comprehension and students' production in writing text. It is because of the level of students' knowledge which fits the content of what they should write<sup>32</sup>.
- c. *Interesting activity*: These activities can be various, such as the possibility of using writing in an unusual and enjoyable way, a writing task of which students can perceive the usefulness, collaborative planning, and writing of an important document<sup>33</sup>.

---

<sup>30</sup> Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. (Cambridge: Longman, 2002), p. 52

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, p. 261

<sup>32</sup> Suzanne Hidi, and Pietro Boscolo, *Writing and Motivation*, (Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), p. 5

<sup>33</sup> Ibid

- d. *Students' Interest*: Interest is an intrinsic factor of writing motivation. It is important part of writing motivation because interest affects so much in students' willingness to write.
- e. *Students' self-efficacy*: Self-efficacy for writing represents individuals' beliefs of their ability to write certain types of texts<sup>34</sup>.
- f. *Students' self-regulation to write*: The students have to coordinate cognitive, metacognitive, and linguistic processes when producing extended texts. They have to select sources to gain information, make choices about ideas to be included, adopt strategies about the use of time<sup>35</sup>.
- g. *Socio-constructivist approach*: Motivation to write really develops when students can write on personal and emancipatory experiences: that is, the expression of ideas, constructions and beliefs. The aspects of the classroom culture, which may hinder motivation to write, such as emphasis on teacher's evaluation and focus on correct form.

In other words, students' writing motivation is influenced by either intrinsic factors or extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors are students' interest to write, and students' self-efficacy. Extrinsic factors are teacher, topic and situation interestingness, and students' social condition. These factors can be indicated by the students' performance in writing and by students' self-regulation in writing activity.

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid, p. 6

<sup>35</sup>Suzanne Hidi, and Pietro Boscolo, *Writing and Motivation*, (Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), p. 8

#### 4. The Nature of Using Video

##### a. Video as Teaching Medium

Video is one of new kind of teaching media used in teaching and learning. Video can be defined as the tool that record, producing and broadcasting moving visual images with audio system. The video has some characteristics; in his study, Hasibuan and Anshari found that a video has:

- 1) Sound;
- 2) Moving Picture (The pictures give context to the sound we hear. We can see facial expressions, eye contact, physical relationships, background, etc);
- 3) A 'rewind' button: we can replay these image again and again;
- 4) A 'pause' button: we can freeze-frame images, stopping the action at any point;
- 5) A volume control; we can turn the sound off, or make it quite or very loud<sup>36</sup>.

In their recent study, Bossewitch and Preston found that video is used increasingly across a wide variety of learning contexts, and is no longer limited to film and media studies. Video-based materials appear in the curricula of the

---

<sup>36</sup>KalayoHasibuan, *Teaching Media*. (Pekanbaru: UIN SUSKA, 2006), p.351

humanities, natural and social sciences, and fine arts<sup>37</sup>. In applying the video in the classroom, the teacher should pay attention to the following aspects:

- 1) Always preview and evaluate the video even if you produced it yourself.  
It will help establish relevance in terms of the points or visuals you wish to emphasize during the viewing.
- 2) Check the room's lighting, seating, picture and sound quality to be sure that everyone can see and hear the video when it is played.
- 3) Prepare students by briefly reviewing previous related studies, or teach prerequisite skills in order to equalize students' background. Brief them on the video's contents and list the key points or questions to direct attention to specific aspects of the video.
- 4) For recapitulation or further discussion, re-play the video to consolidate information which was previously presented rapidly. This contributes to the overall learning experience as students will have the opportunity to see what they have missed in the first showing. Since watching a video is mostly a passive activity, you should introduce activities to motivate student participation, especially before and after the playback
- 5) Conduct post-viewing discussions or quizzes to emphasize key issues or points. Redirect attention to new content or concepts, and help students to process complex information. Assign reading lists and project work

---

<sup>37</sup> Jonah Bossewitch and Michael D. Preston, "Teaching and Learning with Video Annotation", *Learning through Digital Media Experiments in Pedagogy and Technology*, (2011)

and so on. You may identify other activities that would help to reinforce student learning<sup>38</sup>.

From the statement above, it is clear that video is effective to use in the classroom as a teaching medium because video is not just interesting, but also it can fit the curriculum used at school.

#### b. Using Video in ELT

For about 20 years, video has been considered as an effective teaching aid. Video is one of the recent teaching aids used in classroom compared with other teaching aids, such as audiotapes, textbooks, and basic black board. According to Stempleski in Richard and Renandya, video is an extremely dense medium, one which incorporates a wide variety of visual elements and a great range of audio experiences in addition to spoken language<sup>39</sup>. It is also the extremely motivational teaching tool for both practicing listening skill and stimulating speaking and writing<sup>40</sup>. Video as the recent teaching technological aid used in ELT has given the good contributions for English skill development. It can function as the motivational teaching equipment with the elements of visual and audio that is useful in improvement of listening skill or stimulating the speaking and writing skill.

Video as one of teaching media must broadcast the materials used in ELT. In affording of making the video effective in English Language Teaching and

---

<sup>38</sup> "Teaching with video", *Learning to Teach, Teaching to Learn*

<sup>39</sup> Jack C. Richard, and Willy A. Renandya, *Methodology in Language Teaching*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p . 364

<sup>40</sup> Johanna E. Katchen, "Video in ELT", (2002)

Learning process, according to Hasibuan and Ansyari, the materials used in the classroom should be RICH<sup>41</sup>. RICH stands for:

- 1) *Real*: Materials contain a real need for English for survival such as to make friends, to study, to shop, to travel, etc.
- 2) *Interesting*: Materials should interest students to learn and should lead them to be independent/autonomous learners. Such as materials must provide various learning activities that are fun and enjoyable for students.
- 3) *Concrete*: Materials can represent students' needs, which are relevant, meaningful and authentic and embedded in a context that makes sense to students.
- 4) *Humanistic*: Materials suit the background of students concerning the ages, native language, and culture, educational background, and motivation or purpose of learning English.

Video is one of the recent teaching aids used in English Language Teaching for both second and foreign language. It presents the students the use of language in context by giving the visual and audio elements which can assist the students' listening, speaking, and writing skill. The video should be used regarding the situation of the class, learning material, and students' condition.

---

<sup>41</sup>KalayoHasibuanand MuhammadFauzanAnsyari, *Teaching English as a Foreign Language* . (Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press, 2007),p. 76

## 5. Using Video towards Students' Writing Motivation

### a. The Advantages of Using Video towards Students' Writing Motivation

Based on the study of Aiex and Kortner, Teachers have long used the media, and particularly film, to accomplish various instructional objectives such as building background for particular topics or motivating student reaction and analysis. The appeal of visual media continues to make film, video, and television educational tools with high potential impact; and they are now considerably more accessible and less cumbersome to use<sup>42</sup>. Wlodkowski stated that the students tend to pay more attention in restoring their interest and energy by using the changing things.

In ELT, video can be applied in several activities. These can be process of instruction between learners and instructional activities, such as lecturing, discussing, showing a video, and playing game. Then, the learning materials as physical resources used to instruct, such as films, book, etc<sup>43</sup>. Also, Stempleski and Tomalin said that children and adult feel their interest quicken when language experienced in a lively way through television and video; the combination of moving picture and sound can present language more comprehensively than any other teaching medium<sup>44</sup>.

In short, the advantages of using video in ELT are motivating students' reaction in learning English, paying students' attention restoring their interest and energy, and as the physical resource used as instruction.

---

<sup>42</sup> Aiex, and Nola Kortner, "Using Film, Video, and TV in the Classroom", (1988).

<sup>43</sup> Raymond. J. Woldkowski and Margery B Ginsberg, *Teaching Intensive and Accelerated Courses* (San Fransisco: Jossey Bass, 2010), p. 105

<sup>44</sup> Susan Stempleski and Barry Tomalin, *Video in Action*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 3

Harmer stated that there are some reasons why video can add the special, extra dimension in the learning experience<sup>45</sup>:

- 1) *Seeing language in use*: One of the main advantages of video is that students do not just hear the language, they see it too. This greatly aids comprehension, since for example, general meaning and moods are often conveyed through expression, gesture, and other visual clues. Thus, we can observe how intonation can match facial expression. All such paralinguistic features give valuable meaning clues and help viewers see beyond what they are listening to, and thus interpret the text more deeply.
- 2) *Cross-cultural awareness*: Video uniquely allows students a look at situations far beyond their classrooms. This is especially useful if they want to see, for example, typical British 'body language' when inviting someone out, or how Americans speak to waiters. Video is also of great value in giving students a chance to see such things as what kinds of food people eat in other countries, and what they wear.
- 3) *The power of creation*: When students use video cameras themselves they are given the potential to create something memorable and enjoyable. The camera operators and directors suddenly have considerable power. The task of video making can provoke genuinely

---

<sup>45</sup> Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. (Cambridge: Longman, 2002), p. 282



creative and communicative use of the language, with students finding themselves doing new thing in English.

- 4) *Motivation*: For all of the reasons so far mentioned, most students show an increased level of interest when they have a chance to see language in use as well as hear it, and when this is coupled with interesting tasks.

Video also benefits in English language learning because it can show the students the contextual use of language, the culture of the language learned, creativity, and motivation in learning English language.

Video is very advantageous to use in English teaching and learning activities because it can develop English language skills, such as Practicing listening, and stimulating speaking and writing. For writing skill, video can be used as stimulus in developing idea as well as effective to motivate the students in expressive writing. According to Raimes in Richard and Renandya, to open up the classroom to shared experiences-to topic to stimulate writing-, teachers turn other materials, such as videos, software, and books<sup>46</sup>.

In addition, a recent study by Tatsuki shows that video can be used as a stimulus to write in a variety of genres, styles and persuasive forms<sup>47</sup>. In Addition, Wolf stated that using engaging and popular video materials, to be highly effective in eliciting creative, fluent and remarkably expressive writing from otherwise

---

<sup>46</sup>Jack C. Richard, and Willy A. Renandya, *Methodology In Language Teaching*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.311

<sup>47</sup>Donna Hurts Tatsuki , “Narrating in Simple Past with Video”, The Internet TESL Journal, Vol IV, (1998)

recalcitrant and unmotivated students<sup>48</sup>. It is clear that video is so effective if it is used in improving writing motivation because it can improve the creativity in expression; stimulate to write with various genres including narrative text.

#### b. The Roles of Teacher in Using Video

According to Davis, The key of using video effectively still lies in the teacher's ability to not only **deliver** the message, but to empower students to **receive** it<sup>49</sup>. In addition, Stempski in Richard and Renandya stated that the teacher plays the key role in the success or failure of any video used in language classroom. It is the teacher who selects the video, relates the video to the students' needs, promotes active viewing, and integrates the video with other areas of language curriculum<sup>50</sup>. In conclusion, teacher has the very significant roles in using of video in ELT because the teacher is who knows whatever is necessary in the classroom and can treat the students with whatever they need in language learning process.

According to Stempski in Richard and Renandya, the teacher using the video should have experience to make it effective in the classroom; yet, for the teacher who as no experiences in using video might find the following suggestion helpful<sup>51</sup>:

---

<sup>48</sup> Grant S. Wolf, "Using Video to Develop Writing Fluency in Low- Proficiency ESL Students", *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol XII, 2006

<sup>49</sup> Randal S. Davis, "Captioned Video, Make It Work for You", *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol IV, (1998)

<sup>50</sup> Jack C. Richard, and Willy A. Renandya, *Methodology in Language Teaching*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 364

<sup>51</sup> Ibid, p. 365

- 1) *Guide students toward appreciating video as a language learning tool:* Video or television is usually related to many leisure and entertainment so the students watching video in the classroom expect for entertainment. The teacher should be able to lead the students to appreciate the video not only as the entertainment, but mainly as language learning tool that can improve their language skills. Usually, when we watch TV or video for entertainment, they will be passive because we do not concentrate to what is happening in the video. This is the teacher's job to make the students to make their eyes, ears, and mind concentrate on the video in increasing their comprehension. However, the video still remains the entertainment for students, but students will understand the use of video in learning.
- 2) *Make the Video an Integral Part of the Course:* The video can be very effective for learning if it is used as an integral part of the course. The teacher should fit the video as supplementary material to the goal of the course. It can be done by choosing the topic of video based on the topic in the curriculum or students' textbook.
- 3) *Use Short Sequences:* Actually, there is no exact length of video used in the classroom, but based on Stempski experience, it is better to use short (3 or 5 minutes) segment video. It is done to avoid the less effectiveness if the longer sequenced video is used. The teacher can do it by making a

long sequenced video into many parts so it can interest the students in other parts of the video.

- 4) *Familiarize yourself with the Material:* Before using the video in the classroom, it is better for the teacher to ensure that she/he has viewed the entire sequences of the video. It can be done several times with the video transcript in the hand. It is done to reduce the difficulties if the students have questions about the video.
- 5) *Treat the Video as Both a Visual and an Audio Text:* A video sequence is a text, somewhat like language presentation passage in a book or a dialogue in an audio cassette. The most important thing in either written text or audio cassette is not just the words, but also visual elements (often sound effect and music) that provide essential evidence on behaviour, character, and context, which are not usually in the script. When planning a lesson, the teacher does not just consider about the video script but also video itself. The teacher can play the video with the sound turned-off. It is done to see how we can comprehend the video, if the body language describes anything said, if the camera focuses on whom speaking, or if the location shots any context.
- 6) *Design Lessons that Provide Opportunities for Repeated Viewing:* Once is not enough to play the video. The students usually need to watch the video for several times. Although the video played is in their native language, it is sometimes not enough for them to comprehend the

content of the video, such as situations, characters, recall language, and other facts involved in the video. Thus, it is necessary for teacher to provide the repeated viewing.

- 7) *Plan Activities for Three Stages:* The stages consist of: Previewing activities, Viewing activities, and Post viewing activities.

*Previewing Activities.* These prepare the students to watch the video by tapping their background knowledge, stimulating interest in the topic, and lessening their fear of unfamiliar vocabulary.

*Viewing Activities.* These primarily facilitate the actual viewing of video. They involve playing and replaying the entire sequence or relevant part and requiring students to focus on important aspects such as factual information, plot development, or the language used in a particular situation first. You would then will have students do a series of task that require them to concentrate on specific detail, such as sequence of events or a particular utterances used.

*Postviewing Activities.* These require students to react to the video or to practice some particular language point. The range of post-viewing activities is enormous and includes things such as discussion, role-play, debate, writing activities, and related reading.

## B. Relevant Research

As a matter of fact, there are some of research reports that have relevancy toward this research paper. The first title is “**The use of audiovisual (VCD/DVD) to increase students’ interest learning English at the second year of MTs Al – WathanRupat**” conducted by Hermadaliza. This is an experimental research. This research mostly discusses about the use of video to increase students’ interest in learning English. In collecting the data, she used observation and questionnaire. In the research finding, there is an improvement in students’ interest in learning English by using audiovisual (VCD/DVD) that is increased in experimental class from 57,4% to 70,7% of Students’ interest in the classroom. From this research, she found that there is a significant effect of using audiovisual (VCD/DVD) toward students’ interest in learning English at MTs Al-Wathan. It means that  $H_a$  was accepted and  $H_o$  was rejected.

The second research title is “**An analysis of students’ interest in watching English video animation program by the fifth year students of State Elementary School 031 TampanPekanbaru**” conducted by Rena Fitryani. This is a descriptive research. Based on the research finding, approximately 56% to 75% of the students are interested in watching video animation program. This can be classified that students’ interest is **enough**. Next, the characteristics of interest that influence the students’ interest in watching English video animation program is that the students usually talk about the object that they are interested in, in this case the English video

animation program, that can be categorized as **high**. This is because most of students usually talk about object that they are interested in their communications. Approximately 75, 62% or 76% of students usually talk about English video animation program that can be categorized as high.

### **C. Operational Concept**

To avoid misunderstanding and misinterpreting the concept of this research, it is important for the writer to give the operational concept in this research to make it easy to measure and assess. It means that it is necessary to expose to avoid some misinterpreting for the readers of this thesis. Thus, the main technical terms existed in this research to be are necessarily operated in this research.

There are some factors necessarily to be operated in this operational concept. In this research, there are two variables; they are (1) using video as X variable and (2) Students' motivation in writing narrative text as Y variable. Because this research is quasi experimental research, the writer divided the class into two classes, experimental class and control class. The data were taken by using questionnaire (pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire). The writer as the researcher in this case did the research to the samples separated into two classes. The experimental class was treated by using video and the control class was taught by using the teacher' usual strategy (three phase-technique). However, the questionnaire that was given was the same between both classes; the difference was only on the

treatment which was given. The treatment was used for students' motivation in writing narrative text. The operational concept for each variable can be described as follows:

### **1. Variable X: Teaching treatment by using video**

According to Stempski in Richard and Renandya, the procedures to apply the video in language class<sup>52</sup>, including:

- a. The teacher prepares the students to watch the video by tapping their background knowledge, stimulating interest in the topic, and lessening their fear of unfamiliar vocabulary.
- b. The teacher primarily facilitates the actual viewing of video. They involve playing and replaying the entire sequence or relevant parts.
- c. The teacher requires students to focus on important aspects such as factual information, plot development, or the language used in a particular situation first.
- d. The teacher then will have students do a series of task that require them to concentrate on specific detail, such as sequence of events or a particular utterances used.
- e. The teacher requires students to react to the video or to practice some particular language point. The range of post-viewing activities is enormous; in this term is writing narrative text activity.

---

<sup>52</sup> Jack C. Richard, and Willy A. Renandya, *Methodology in Language Teaching*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 364



## 2. Variable Y: Students' writing motivation

Dealt with the video used to treat the students, the indicators of students' motivation in writing narrative text are as follows<sup>53</sup>:

- a. The students write narrative text for particular reasons
- b. The students always afford to improve their ability to write narrative text
- c. The students finish their narrative writing task by their own way
- d. The students show their adequateness in narrative writing activity
- e. The students show their competence in writing narrative text
- f. The students assign the time to write narrative writing
- g. The students use metacognitive tools to write good narrative text
- h. The students resist the temptation of giving up writing narrative text

## D. Assumption and Hypotheses

### 1. Assumption

Before starting hypotheses as temporary answers of the problem, the writer would like to present assumption as follows:

- a. Students' motivation in writing is various.
- b. The better the use of video, the higher students' motivation in writing narrative text will be.

---

<sup>53</sup> Suzanne Hidi and Pietro Boscolo, *Writing and Motivation* (Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), p. 2

## **2. Hypotheses**

To answer the problem formulated in this research, the writer makes is hypotheses as follows:

Ho: There is no significant effect of using video towards students' motivation in writing narrative text..

Ha: There is significant effect of using video towards students' motivation in writing narrative text.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### A. The Research Design

The design of this research is quasi experimental research which is intended to find out the effect of using video toward students' motivation in writing narrative text. It was done because of the availability of the participants or because the setting prohibits forming artificial group<sup>1</sup>. This research was focused on the Nonequivalent Control Group Design involving an experimental group and a control group both given a pretest and a posttest<sup>2</sup>. In this research, there are two variables; the independent variable (X) is the using of video and the dependent variable (Y) is the students' motivation in writing narrative text. This research design can be seen as follows<sup>3</sup>:

**Table III.1**

#### Difference Between Control and Experimental Group

Select Control Group	Prequestionnaire	No treatment	Postquestionnaire
Select Experimental Group	Prequestionnaire	Treatment by Using Video	Postquestionnaire

---

<sup>1</sup> John W. Creswell, *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. (New Jersey: Pearson Education. 2008), p. 313

<sup>2</sup> Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, *Experimental and Quasi Experimental Designs for Research*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1963), p. 47

<sup>3</sup> John W. Creswell, *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. (New Jersey: Pearson Education. 2008), p.314

## **B. Location and Time of the Research**

In accordance of the background of the problem that has been explained before, this research was conducted at the second year students of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency. This research began on January to March 2012.

## **C. The Object and Subject of the Research**

The object of this research was the using of video in improving students' motivation in writing narrative text. In this research, the writer used eight different videos consisting kinds of story in each video; the tittle of the videos are as follows:

1. *Why mosquitoes buzz in people ears?*
2. *The Black Cat*
3. *Bawang Merah and Bawang Putih*
4. *The wolf and seven kids*
5. *Timun Mas*
6. *Puss in boots*
7. *The tortoise and the hare*
8. *The little red hen*

The subject of this research was the second semester of the second year students of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir in the academic year 2011/2012.

#### D. The Population and the Sample of the Research

The population of this research was the second year students of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency in the academic year of 2011/2012. The writer used two classes as samples of this research by using Cluster Sampling; it is a sampling technique involving some groups integrated on the clusters and the sample is taken randomly<sup>4</sup>. The samples taken were 67 students; they were class XI IPA 1 and XI IPA 2. The detail of the sample is as follows:

**Table III.2**

**The Population and the Sample of the Research**

NO	Class	Students			Sample
		Male	Female	Total	
1	XI.IPS-1	14	27	41	Sample
2	XI.IPS-2	16	25	41	
3	XI.IPS-3	14	27	41	
4	XI.IPS-4	19	22	41	
5	XI.IPA-1	11	22	33	
6	XI.IPA-2	11	23	34	
7	XI.IPA-3	10	24	34	
8	XI.IPA-4	15	20	35	
9	XI.MAK-1	18	15	33	
10	XI.MAK-2	18	15	33	
	<b>Population</b>	146	221	367	

---

<sup>4</sup>Hartono, *Metode Penelitian*, (Pekanbaru: Zanafra, 2011), p. 52

## **E. Data Collection Technique**

### **1. Observation**

An observation is the current status of a phenomenon determined by observing<sup>5</sup>. Suharsimi says that there are two types of observation; systematic and non-systematic observation<sup>6</sup>. In this research, the observation was the systematic observation. The observation was used to get the clear data about the implementation of video in teaching writing. It was done by the English teacher as the observer by using observation list.

### **2. Questionnaire**

The writer collected the data by using questionnaire. The purpose of this instrument is to collect the data containing series of question for respondents dealing with students' motivation in writing narrative text. The questionnaire was presented as pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire to find out the effect of using video toward students' motivation in writing narrative text. The questionnaire used likert scales; they are never (1), seldom (2), sometimes (3), often (4), and always (5).

Before using the questionnaire as the instrument to obtain the information about students' motivation in writing narrative text, the writer did a try-out for testing the validity and the reliability of the questionnaire items. The validity of the items can be interpreted by using factor analysis that is by correlating between scores of each

---

<sup>5</sup>L.R Gay and Peter Airasian. *Educational Research: competencies for analysis and application sixth edition*. (New Jersey: Prentice hall, 2000), p.294

<sup>6</sup>Suharsimi Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian; Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. (Jakarta: PT. Asdi Mahasatya. 2006), p. 157

item and its total scores. It can be done by using *Product Moment Correlation*<sup>7</sup>, as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

Each item of the instrument was counted the correlation coefficient with its total scores, and the next step is as follows:

$$t_{test} = \frac{r\sqrt{n-2}}{\sqrt{1-r^2}}$$

In try-out, the writer gave students 30 items of questionnaire. These items represented 10 indicators of the students' motivation in writing narrative text. The try-out was done to the second year students of IPA 4 in MAN Tembilahan. The class is not the class used in research process. The result of the Try-out can be seen as follows:

---

<sup>7</sup>Hartono, *Metode Penelitian*, (Pekanbaru: Zanafra, 2011), p. 67

**Table III.3****Recapitulation of the Research Instrument Validity**

<b>Number of Items</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>tTable</b>	<b>t Test</b>	<b>Validity</b>	<b>Classifications</b>
1	31	1,309	2,942	Valid	Used
2	31	1,309	1,812	Valid	Used
3	31	1,309	1,643	Valid	Used
4	31	1,309	4,304	Valid	Used
5	31	1,309	2,695	Valid	Used
6	31	1,309	1,165	Not valid	Unused
7	31	1,309	5,571	Valid	Used
8	31	1,309	3,181	Valid	Used
9	31	1,309	2,96	Valid	Used
10	31	1,309	3,529	Valid	Used
11	31	1,309	2,803	Valid	Used
12	31	1,309	2,88	Valid	Used
13	31	1,309	5,005	Valid	Used
14	31	1,309	2,99	Valid	Used
15	31	1,309	2,09	Valid	Used
16	31	1,309	2,64	Valid	Used
17	31	1,309	3,882	Valid	Used
18	31	1,309	1,45	Valid	Used
19	31	1,309	4	Valid	Used
20	31	1,309	4,554	Valid	Used
21	31	1,309	-2,105	Not valid	Unused
22	31	1,309	1,576	Valid	Used
23	31	1,309	0,961	Not valid	Unused
24	31	1,309	2,577	Valid	Used
25	31	1,309	2,04	Valid	Used
26	31	1,309	2,224	Valid	Used
27	31	1,309	0,319	Not valid	Unused
28	31	1,309	4,419	Valid	Used
29	31	1,309	4,118	Valid	Used
30	31	1,309	2,766	Valid	Used



Based on the result of the try-out, only 26 items of the questionnaire were valid. And these validated items were used as the instrument to collect the data of students' motivation in writing narrative text. However, in this research, the writer did not do the reliability test because according to Setiyadi, the measuring instruments which qualify the elements of validity must qualify the elements of reliability<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, the instrument used must have been reliable.

## **F. Data Analysis Technique**

In this research, there are three formulations of the problem that the writer tried to find out the result of the research. The writer used some techniques to analyze the data to find out the information about students' motivation in writing narrative text toward both experimental class and control class as well as the effect of using video toward students' motivation in writing narrative text. The writer did the following computation on the observation list of the use of video in experimental class and the data of questionnaires of the students' motivation in writing narrative text for both classes:

1. To find out the percentage of the observation result on experimental class, the formula is :

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

In which:

---

<sup>8</sup>Bambang Setiyadi, *Metode Penelitian dan Pengajaran Bahasa Asing*, (Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2006), p.13

P: Percentage

F: Frequency

N: Number of items<sup>9</sup>

The interpretation of the formula above is as follows<sup>10</sup>:

No	Categories	Frequency
1	Very Good	80%-100%
2	Good	66%-79%
3	Enough	56%-65%
4	Less	40%-55%
5	Fail	30%-39%

2. To find out the level of students' motivation in writing narrative text, the writer used the following formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

In which:

P: Percentage

F: Frequency

N: Number of items

The interpretation of the formula above is as follows<sup>11</sup>:

---

<sup>9</sup>Anas Sudjono, 2000, *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*, (Jakarta: PT Grafindo Persada), p. 40

<sup>10</sup>SuharsimiArikunto,*Dasar-dasarEvaluasiPendidikan*. (Jakarta: BumiAksara. 2010),p. 245

<sup>11</sup>Riduwan, *Variable-variablePenelitian*, (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2005), p. 15

NO	Categories	Score
1	Very strong	81% - 100%
2	Strong	61% - 80%
3	Enough	41% - 60%
4	Low	21% - 40%
5	Very low	0% - 20%

3. To find the significant effect of using video toward students' motivation in writing narrative text between experimental class and control class, the writer used the formula in Hartono as follows:<sup>12</sup>

$$t_o = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

$t_o$  : The Value of t-obtained

$M_x$  : Mean score of experiment class

$M_y$  : Mean score of control class

$SD_x$  : Standard deviation of experiment class

$SD_y$  : Standard deviation of control class

$N$  : Number of students

---

<sup>12</sup>Hartono. *Statistik Untuk Penelitian*. (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2009), p.208

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **A. Data Description**

The purpose of this research is to find out the students' motivation in writing narrative text who were taught by using Video and taught by using the technique that the teacher usually used (three-phased technique), and also to find out the difference on students' motivation in writing narrative text before they were taught by using video and after they were taught by using video. The research procedures are as follows:

1. The writer gave pre-questionnaire for both experimental and control class.
2. The writer gave treatments for at least eight meetings by using Video for the experimental class and three-phased technique for the control class.
3. The writer gave post-questionnaire for both experimental and control class to find out the difference on students' motivation in writing narrative text before they were taught by using video and after they were taught by using video.

#### **B. Data Presentation**

In this research, there are two data presentation presented by the writer. They are data consisting information about implementation of video in teaching narrative writing gathered by using observation list. The data also consist

of information of students' motivation in writing narrative text gathered by using pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire.

### 1. The Observation Data of Using Video in Teaching Narrative Writing

In order to present the data about the implementation of video in Teaching Narrative writing in experimental class, the writer has collected eight observations for eight meetings in experimental group. The following table describes about the frequency of each items becoming the indicators of using video in teaching narrative writing on experimental group:

**Table IV.1**

#### **The Recapitulation of Observation Data on Experimental Group**

NO	INDICATORS	FREQUENCY			
		YES		NO	
		N	P	N	P
1	The teacher prepares the students to watch the video by tapping their background knowledge, stimulating interest in the topic, and lessening their fear of unfamiliar vocabulary.	8	100%	0	0%
2	The teacher requires students to focus on important aspects such as factual information, plot development, or the language used in a particular situation first..	4	50%	4	50%
3	The teacher primarily facilitates the actual viewing of video. They involve playing and replaying the entire sequence or relevant parts	8	100%	0	0%
4	The teacher then will have students do a series of task that require	6	75%	2	25%

	them to concentrate on specific detail, such as sequence of events or a particular utterances used.				
<b>5</b>	The teacher requires students to react to the video or to practice some particular language point. The range of post-viewing activities is enormous; in this term is writing activity.	8	100%	0	0%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	34	85%	6	15%

The table above shows that the result of the observation about the use of video on experimental group indicates the frequency of answers “yes” is 34 or 85% and the frequency of answers “no” is 6 or 15%.

## **2. The Students’ Motivation in Writing Narrative Text**

Before distributing the questionnaire, the writer had tested the validity of 30 questionnaire items to another class but either experimental or control class; there are 26 items of questionnaire used as research instrument. There are 2 sides of the questionnaire items used in this research; they are positive side used about 25 items and negative side used only 1 item. The writer then distributed Pre and Post Questionnaire to Experimental and Control Group. Next, the writer analyzed the data to get information about the students’ motivation for each item of questionnaire quantitatively and qualitatively. Each questionnaire item shows the following table which indicates the students’ motivation in writing narrative text:

**Table IV.2**  
**The Students Write Narrative Text for Pleasure**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0.0%	14	41.2%	0	0.0%	2	6.1%
2	Often	9	26.5%	16	47.1%	5	15.2%	22	66.7%
3	Sometimes	16	47.1%	1	2.9%	5	15.2%	2	6.1%
4	Seldom	9	26.5%	1	2.9%	21	63.6%	7	21.2%
5	Never	0	0.0%	2	5.9%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

The table above indicates the various responses of the respondents in both experimental class and control class. The result of the questionnaire shown by the table can be interpreted if there is difference on students' writing motivation before and after the treatment. It can be seen that in experimental class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always wrote narrative text for pleasure and there is increase to be 41,2% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 0.0% of respondents in pre-questionnaire questionnaire always wrote narrative text for pleasureand there is increase to be 6, 1% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 26,5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire questionnaire often wrote narrative text for pleasureand there is increase to be 47,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 15,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often wrote narrative text for pleasureand there is increase to be 66,7% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 47,1% of

respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote narrative text for pleasure and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 15,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote narrative text for pleasure and there is decrease to be 6,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 26,5% of respondents in experimental class seldom wrote narrative text for pleasure and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 63,6% of respondents in control class seldom wrote narrative text for pleasure and there is decrease to be 21,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never wrote narrative text for pleasure and there is increase to be 5,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 6,1% of respondents in control class never wrote narrative text for pleasure and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.3**

**The Students Only Practice Writing in English Task**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	19	55.9%	4	12.1%	15	45.5%
2	Often	14	41.2%	12	35.3%	21	63.6%	18	54.5%
3	Sometimes	12	35.3%	3	8.8%	3	9.1%	0	0.0%
4	Seldom	7	20.6%	0	0.0%	5	15.2%	0	0.0%
5	Never	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%



It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always practiced writing only in English task and there is increase to be 55,9% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 12,1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always practiced writing only in English task and there is increase to be 45,5% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 41,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often practiced writing only in English task and there is decrease to be 35,3% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 63,6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often practiced writing only in English task and there is decrease to be 54,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 35,3% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes practiced writing only in English task and there is decrease to be 8,8% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 9,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes practiced writing only in English task and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 20,6% of respondents in experimental class seldom practiced writing only in English task and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 15,2% of respondents in control class seldom practiced writing only in English task and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never practiced writing only in English task and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never practiced writing only in English task and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.4**

**The Students Write Narrative Text Because of Interesting Topics**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	17	50.0%	2	6.1%	6	18.2%
2	Often	16	47.1%	14	41.2%	13	39.4%	20	60.6%
3	Sometimes	7	20.6%	3	8.8%	8	24.2%	3	9.1%
4	Seldom	9	26.5%	0	0.0%	9	27.3%	4	12.1%
5	Never	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is increase to be 50,0% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 6,1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is increase to be 18,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 47,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is decrease to be 41,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 39,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is

increase to be 60,6% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 20,6% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is decrease to be 8,8% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 24,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is decrease to be 9,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 26,5% of respondents in experimental class seldom wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 27,3% of respondents in control class seldom wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is decrease to be 12,1% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 2,9% of respondents in experimental class never wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 3,0% of respondents in control class never wrote narrative text because of interesting topics and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.5****The Students Use Their Language Competence to Write Narrative Text**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	12	35.3%	5	15.2%	14	42.4%
2	Often	16	47.1%	17	50.0%	13	39.4%	14	42.4%
3	Sometimes	11	32.4%	4	11.8%	7	21.2%	1	3.0%
4	Seldom	6	17.6%	1	2.9%	6	18.2%	4	12.1%
5	Never	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always used their language competence to write narrative text and there is increase to be 35,3% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 15,2 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always used their language competence to write narrative text and there is increase to be 42,4% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 47,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used their language competence to write narrative text and there is increase to be 50,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 39,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used their language competence to write narrative text and there is increase to be 42,4% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 32,4% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used their language competence to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 11,8% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 21,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used their language competence to

write narrative text and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 17,1% of respondents in experimental class seldom used their language competence to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 18,2% of respondents in control class seldom used their language competence to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 12,1% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never used their language competence to write narrative text and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 6,1% of respondents in control class never used their language competence to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.6**

**The Students Try To Write in Everyday Situation outside Classroom**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0.0%	3	8.8%	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
2	Often	1	2.9%	16	47.1%	2	6.1%	9	27.3%
3	Sometimes	9	26.5%	8	23.5%	0	0.0%	8	24.2%
4	Seldom	19	55.9%	5	14.7%	23	69.7%	13	39.4%
5	Never	5	14.7%	2	5.9%	7	21.2%	2	6.1%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and there

is increase to be 8,8% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 3,0 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and it is still 3,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and there is increase to be 47,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 6,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and there is increase to be 27,3% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 26,5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and there is decrease to be 23,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and there is increase to be 24,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 55,9% of respondents in experimental class seldom tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and there is decrease to be 14,7% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 69,7% of respondents in control class seldom tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and there is decrease to be 39,4% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 14,7% of respondents in experimental class never tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and there is decrease to be 5,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 21,2% of

respondents in control class never tried to write in everyday situation outside classroom and there is decrease to be 6,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV. 7**

**The Students Try Hard To Write Narrative Text**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	4	11.8%	20	58.8%	5	15.2%	7	21.2%
2	Often	17	50.0%	12	35.3%	18	54.5%	23	69.7%
3	Sometimes	8	23.5%	1	2.9%	5	15.2%	3	9.1%
4	Seldom	5	14.7%	1	2.9%	5	15.2%	0	0.0%
5	Never	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 11,8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always tried hard to write narrative text and there is increase to be 28,8% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 15,2 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always tried hard to write narrative text and there is increase to be 21,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 50,0 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often tried hard to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 35,3% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 54,5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often tried hard to write narrative text and there is increase to be 69,7% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 23,5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes tried hard to write narrative text and there is decrease

to be 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 15,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes tried hard to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 9,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 14,7% of respondents in experimental class seldom tried hard to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 15,2% of respondents in control class seldom tried hard to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never tried hard to write narrative text and it is 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never tried hard to write narrative text and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.8**

**The Students Do Their Narrative Writing Homework Seriously**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0.0%	13	38.2%	3	9.1%	8	24.2%
2	Often	15	44.1%	17	50.0%	12	36.4%	21	63.6%
3	Sometimes	11	32.4%	3	8.8%	13	39.4%	2	6.1%
4	Seldom	7	20.6%	1	2.9%	5	15.2%	2	6.1%
5	Never	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%



It can be seen that in experimental class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always did their narrative writing homework seriously and there is increase to be 38,2% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 9,1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always did their narrative writing homework seriously and there is increase to be 24,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 44,1 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often did their narrative writing homework seriously and there is increase to be 50,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 36,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often did their narrative writing homework seriously and there is increase to be 63,6% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 32,4% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes did their narrative writing homework seriously and there is decrease to be 8,8% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 39,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes did their narrative writing homework seriously and there is decrease to be 6,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 20,6% of respondents in experimental class seldom did their narrative writing homework seriously and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 15,2% of respondents in control class seldom did their narrative writing homework seriously and there is decrease to be 6,1% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,9% of respondents in experimental class never did their narrative writing homework seriously and there is decrease to be 0,0%

of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never did their narrative writing homework seriously and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.9**

**The Students Organize Their Idea When They Write Narrative Text**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0.0%	6	17.6%	1	3.0%	4	12.1%
2	Often	5	14.7%	17	50.0%	7	21.2%	11	33.3%
3	Sometimes	10	29.4%	8	23.5%	8	24.2%	6	18.2%
4	Seldom	17	50.0%	3	8.8%	16	48.5%	12	36.4%
5	Never	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is increase to be 17,6% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 3,0 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is increase to be 12,1% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 14,7 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is increase to be 50,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 21,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is increase to be 33,3% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 29,4% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes

organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 23,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 24,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 18,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 50,0% of respondents in experimental class seldom organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 8,8% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 48,5% of respondents in control class seldom organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 36,4% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 5,9% of respondents in experimental class never organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 3,0% of respondents in control class never organized their idea when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.10****The Students Write Narrative Text Based on What They Have Learned**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	5	14.7%	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
2	Often	3	8.8%	17	50.0%	10	30.3%	16	48.5%
3	Sometimes	11	32.4%	7	20.6%	4	12.1%	8	24.2%
4	Seldom	19	55.9%	5	14.7%	16	48.5%	8	24.2%
5	Never	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and there is increase to be 14,7% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 3,0 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and it is still 3,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 8,8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and there is increase to be 50,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 30,3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and there is increase to be 48,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 32,4% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and there is decrease to be 20,6% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 12,1% of the respondents in

pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and there is increase to be 24,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 55,9% of respondents in experimental class seldom wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and there is decrease to be 14,7% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 48,5% of respondents in control class seldom wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and there is decrease to be 24,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never wrote narrative text based on what they had learned and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.11**

**The Students Actively Participate in Learning about Narrative Text**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0.0%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	Often	2	5.9%	14	41.2%	2	6.1%	10	30.3%
3	Sometimes	5	14.7%	8	23.5%	4	12.1%	6	18.2%
4	Seldom	23	67.6%	7	20.6%	23	69.7%	16	48.5%
5	Never	4	11.8%	1	2.9%	4	12.1%	1	3.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always participated in learning about narrative text actively and there is

increase to be 11,8% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 0,0 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always participated in learning about narrative text actively and it is still 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 5,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often participated in learning about narrative text actively and there is increase to be 41,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 6,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often participated in learning about narrative text actively and there is increase to be 30,3% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 14,7% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes participated in learning about narrative text actively and there is increase to be 23,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 12,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes participated in learning about narrative text actively and there is increase to be 18,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 67,6% of respondents in experimental class seldom participated in learning about narrative text actively and there is decrease to be 20,6% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 69,7% of respondents in control class seldom participated in learning about narrative text actively and there is decrease to be 48,5% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 11,8% of respondents in experimental class never participated in learning about narrative text actively and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 12,1% of

respondents in control class never participated in learning about narrative text actively and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.12**

**The Students Submit Their Narrative Writing Task on Time**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	Often	1	2.9%	13	38.2%	0	0.0%	8	24.2%
3	Sometimes	2	5.9%	12	35.3%	2	6.1%	5	15.2%
4	Seldom	27	79.4%	7	20.6%	26	78.8%	18	54.5%
5	Never	4	11.8%	1	2.9%	5	15.2%	2	6.1%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always submitted their narrative task on time and there is increase to be 2,9% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 0,0 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always submitted their narrative task on time and it is still 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often submitted their narrative task on time and there is increase to be 38,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often submitted their narrative task on time and there is increase to be 24,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 5,9% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes submitted their narrative task on time and there is increase to be 35,3% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control

class, 6,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes submitted their narrative task on time and there is increase to be 15,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 79,4% of respondents in experimental class seldom submitted their narrative task on time and there is decrease to be 20,6% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 78,8% of respondents in control class seldom submitted their narrative task on time and there is decrease to be 54,5% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 11,8% of respondents in experimental class never submitted their narrative task on time and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 15,2% of respondents in control class never submitted their narrative task on time and there is decrease to be 6,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.13**

**The Students Try To Comprehend the Material to Ease Them in Writing**

**Narrative Text**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	7	20.6%	2	6.1%	6	18.2%
2	Often	8	23.5%	18	52.9%	7	21.2%	15	45.5%
3	Sometimes	9	26.5%	7	20.6%	13	39.4%	3	9.1%
4	Seldom	14	41.2%	2	5.9%	11	33.3%	8	24.2%
5	Never	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%



It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always tried to comprehend the material to ease them in writing narrative text and there is increase to be 20,6% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 6,1 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always tried to comprehend the material to ease them in writing narrative text and there is increase to be 18,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 23,5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often tried to comprehend the material to ease them in writing narrative text and there is increase to be 52,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 21,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often tried to comprehend the material to ease them in writing narrative text and there is increase to be 45,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 26,5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes tried to comprehend the material to ease them in writing narrative text and there is decrease to be 20,6% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 39,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes tried to comprehend the material to ease them in writing narrative text and there is decrease to be 9,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 41,2% of respondents in experimental class seldom tried to comprehend the material to ease them in writing narrative text and there is decrease to be 5,9% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 33,3% of respondents in control class seldom tried to comprehend the

material to ease them in writing and there is decrease to be 24,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 5,9% of respondents in experimental class never tried to comprehend the material to ease them in writing and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never tried to comprehend the material to ease them in writing and there is increase to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.14**

**The Students Use Media and Other Learning Sources to Help Them in  
Collecting Information to Write**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0.0%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	3	9.1%
2	Often	2	5.9%	18	52.9%	8	24.2%	12	36.4%
3	Sometimes	9	26.5%	7	20.6%	5	15.2%	6	18.2%
4	Seldom	20	58.8%	4	11.8%	18	54.5%	10	30.3%
5	Never	3	8.8%	1	2.9%	2	6.1%	2	6.1%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting information to write and there is increase to be 11,8% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 0,0 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting

information to write and there is increase to be 9,1% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 5,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting information to write and there is increase to be 52,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 24,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting information to write and there is increase to be 36,4% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 26,5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting information to write and there is decrease to be 20,6% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 15,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting information to write and there is increase to be 18,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 58,8% of respondents in experimental class seldom used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting information to write and there is decrease to be 11,8% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 54,5% of respondents in control class seldom used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting information to write and there is decrease to be 30,3% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 8,8% of respondents in experimental class never used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting information to write and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 6,1% of respondents in control class never used media and other language learning sources to help them in collecting information to write and it is still 6,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.15**

**The Students Write Narrative Text for Pleasure in Their Free Time in English**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				EXPERIMENTAL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	7	20.6%	2	6.1%	3	9.1%
2	Often	6	17.6%	12	35.3%	7	21.2%	17	51.5%
3	Sometimes	13	38.2%	8	23.5%	17	51.5%	7	21.2%
4	Seldom	14	41.2%	6	17.6%	7	21.2%	5	15.2%
5	Never	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is increase to be 20,6% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 6,1 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is increase to be 9,1% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 17,6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is increase to

be 35,3% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 21,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is increase to be 51,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 38,2% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is decrease to be 23,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 51,5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is decrease to be 21,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 41,2% of respondents in experimental class seldom wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is decrease to be 17,6% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 21,2% of respondents in control class seldom wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is decrease to be 12,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is increase to be 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never wrote narrative text for pleasure in their free time in English and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.16**

**The Students Try To Write Narrative Text in Comfortable, Quiet Place Where  
They Can Concentrate**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				EXPERIMENTAL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	Often	2	5.9%	13	38.2%	1	3.0%	6	18.2%
3	Sometimes	3	8.8%	13	38.2%	0	0.0%	7	21.2%
4	Seldom	24	70.6%	7	20.6%	28	84.8%	17	51.5%
5	Never	5	14.7%	0	0.0%	4	12.1%	3	9.1%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always tried to write narrative text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and there is increase to be 2,9% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 0,0 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always tried to write narrative text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and it is still 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 5,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often tried to write narrative text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and there is increase to be 38,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 3,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often tried to write narrative text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and there is increase to be 18,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 8,8% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes tried to write narrative

text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and there is decrease to be 38,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 0,0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes tried to write narrative text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and there is increase to be 31,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 70,6% of respondents in experimental class seldom tried to write narrative text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and there is decrease to be 20,6% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 84,8% of respondents in control class seldom tried to write narrative text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and there is decrease to be 51,5% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 14,7% of respondents in experimental class never tried to write narrative text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 12,1% of respondents in control class never tried to write narrative text in comfortable, quiet place where they could concentrate and there is decrease to be 9,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.17****The Students Avoid the Teacher to Evaluate Their Writing Task**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%
2	Often	3	8.8%	5	14.7%	3	9.1%	9	27.3%
3	Sometimes	5	14.7%	9	26.5%	7	21.2%	5	15.2%
4	Seldom	23	67.6%	14	41.2%	19	57.6%	16	48.5%
5	Never	2	5.9%	3	8.8%	4	12.1%	2	6.1%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

This item of the questionnaire is the negative aspect of the motivation. It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is increase to be 8,8% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 0,0 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is increase to be 3,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 8,8 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is increase to be 14,7% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 9,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is increase to be 27,3% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 14,7% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is increase to be 26,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 21,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire



sometimes avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is decrease to be 15,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 67,6% of respondents in experimental class seldom avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is decrease to be 41,2 % of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 57,6% of respondents in control class seldom avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is decrease to be 48,5% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 5,9% of respondents in experimental class never avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is increase to be 8,8% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 12,1% of respondents in control class never avoided the teacher to evaluate their writing task and there is decrease to be 6,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.18**

**The Students Follow the Teacher's Instruction to Write Narrative Text**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	8	23.5%	21	61.8%	10	30.3%	19	57.6%
2	Often	21	61.8%	13	38.2%	19	57.6%	14	42.4%
3	Sometimes	5	14.7%	0	0.0%	4	12.1%	0	0.0%
4	Seldom	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Never	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 23,5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and

there is increase to be 61,8% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 30,3 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and there is increase to be 57,6% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 61,8 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 38,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 57,6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 42,4% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 14,7% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 12,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class seldom followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and it is still 0,0 % of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class seldom followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and it is still 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and it is still 0,0% of

the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never followed the teacher's instruction to write narrative text and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.19**

**The Students Use Their Background Knowledge to Help Them Developing Ideas**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	2	5.9%	19	55.9%	5	15.2%	13	39.4%
2	Often	18	52.9%	11	32.4%	12	36.4%	19	57.6%
3	Sometimes	10	29.4%	3	8.8%	14	42.4%	1	3.0%
4	Seldom	4	11.8%	1	2.9%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
5	Never	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 5,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and there is increase to be 55,9% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 15,2 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and there is increase to be 39,4% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 52,9 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and there is decrease to be 32,4% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 36,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and there is increase to be 57,6% of the respondents in post-

questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 29,4% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and there is decrease to be 8,8% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 42,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 11,8% of respondents in experimental class seldom used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and there is decrease to be 2,9 % of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 6,1% of respondents in control class seldom used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never used their background knowledge to help them developing ideas and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.20**

**The Students Write in Their Native Language First and Then Translate It into English**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	11	32.4%	0	0.0%	5	15.2%
2	Often	5	14.7%	13	38.2%	9	27.3%	19	57.6%
3	Sometimes	11	32.4%	9	26.5%	14	42.4%	3	9.1%
4	Seldom	14	41.2%	1	2.9%	10	30.3%	6	18.2%
5	Never	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always wrote in their native language first and then translated it into English and there is increase to be 32,4% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 0,0 % of respondents in pre-questionnaire always wrote in their native language first and then translated it into English and there is increase to be 15,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 14,7 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often wrote in their native language first and then translated it into English and there is increase to be 38,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 27,3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often wrote in their native language first and then translated it into English and there is increase to be 57,6% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 32,4% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote in their native language first and then translated it into

English and there is decrease to be 26,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 42,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes wrote in their native language first and then translated it into English and there is decrease to be 9,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 41,2% of respondents in experimental class seldom wrote in their native language first and then translated it into English and there is decrease to be 2,9 % of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 30,3% of respondents in control class seldom wrote in their native language first and then translated it into English and there is decrease to be 18,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 8,8% of respondents in experimental class never wrote in their native language first and then translated it into English and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control never wrote in their native language first and then translated it into English and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.21**  
**The Students Use Bilingual-Dictionary**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	4	11.8%	19	55.9%	4	12.1%	11	33.3%
2	Often	18	52.9%	10	29.4%	19	57.6%	21	63.6%
3	Sometimes	10	29.4%	4	11.8%	8	24.2%	0	0.0%
4	Seldom	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	2	6.1%	1	3.0%
5	Never	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 11,8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always used bilingual dictionary and there is increase to be 55,9% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 12,1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always used bilingual dictionary and there is increase to be 33,3% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 52,9 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used bilingual dictionary and there is decrease to be 29,4% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 57,6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used bilingual dictionary and there is increase to be 63,6% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 29,4% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used bilingual dictionary and there is decrease to be 11,8% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 24,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used bilingual dictionary and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 5,9% of respondents in experimental class seldom used bilingual dictionary and there is decrease to be 0,0 % of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 6,1% of respondents in control class seldom used bilingual dictionary and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never used bilingual dictionary and there is increase to be 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never used bilingual dictionary and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.22**

**The Students Discuss What They Are Going To Write With Other Students or Teacher**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	15	44.1%	1	3.0%	5	15.2%
2	Often	16	47.1%	17	50.0%	5	15.2%	17	51.5%
3	Sometimes	10	29.4%	1	2.9%	15	45.5%	2	6.1%
4	Seldom	6	17.6%	1	2.9%	11	33.3%	8	24.2%
5	Never	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always discussed what they were going to write with other students or teacher and there is increase to be 44,1% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 3,0% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always discussed what they



were going to write with other students or teacher and there is increase to be 15,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 47,1 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often discussed what they were going to write with other students or teacher and there is decrease to be 50,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 15,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often discussed what they were going to write with other students or teacher and there is increase to be 51,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 29,4% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes discussed what they were going to write with other students or teacher and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 45,5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes discussed what they were going to write with other students or teacher and there is decrease to be 6,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 17,6% of respondents in experimental class seldom discussed what they were going to write with other students or teacher and there is decrease to be 2,9 % of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 33,3% of respondents in control class seldom discussed what they were going to write with other students or teacher and there is decrease to be 24,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 2,9% of respondents in experimental class never discussed what they were going to write with other students or teacher and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment,

3,0% of respondents in control class never discussed what they were going to write with other students or teacher and it is still 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.23**

**The Students Use Grammar Material in Text Book to Check Things That They Are Not Sure About When They Write Narrative Text**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	2	5.9%	18	52.9%	4	12.1%	9	27.3%
2	Often	17	50.0%	13	38.2%	16	48.5%	22	66.7%
3	Sometimes	9	26.5%	3	8.8%	9	27.3%	1	3.0%
4	Seldom	6	17.6%	0	0.0%	4	12.1%	1	3.0%
5	Never	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 5,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always used grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and there is increase to be 52,9% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 12,1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire strongly always used grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and there is increase to be 27,3% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 50,0 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 38,2% of the respondents in

post-questionnaire. In control class, 48,5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often used grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and there is increase to be 66,7% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 26,5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 8,8% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 27,3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes used grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 17,6% of respondents in experimental class seldom used grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 12,1% of respondents in control class seldom used grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never used grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never used

grammar material in text book to check things that they were not sure about when they wrote narrative text and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**TableIV. 24**

**The Students Ask the Teacher When They Find Difficulties in Writing Narrative Text**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	2	5.9%	21	61.8%	4	12.1%	7	21.2%
2	Often	21	61.8%	11	32.4%	15	45.5%	23	69.7%
3	Sometimes	7	20.6%	1	2.9%	14	42.4%	1	3.0%
4	Seldom	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%
5	Never	1	2.9%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 5,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative text and there is increase to be 61,8% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 12,1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative textand there is increase to be 21,2% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 61,8 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative textand there is decrease to be 32,4% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 45,5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaireoften asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative text and there is increase to be 69,7% of the

respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 14,7% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative text and there is decrease to be 11,8% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 33,3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative text and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 14,7% of respondents in experimental class seldom asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative text and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 12,1% of respondents in control class seldom asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative text and there is decrease to be 6,1% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 2,9% of respondents in experimental class never asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative text and it is still 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never asked the teacher when they found difficulties in writing narrative text and there is increase to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.25**

**The Students Encourage Themselves by Telling Themselves That They Can Do Well**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	6	17.6%	21	61.8%	6	18.2%	10	30.3%
2	Often	18	52.9%	9	26.5%	12	36.4%	20	60.6%
3	Sometimes	5	14.7%	4	11.8%	11	33.3%	1	3.0%
4	Seldom	5	14.7%	0	0.0%	4	12.1%	2	6.1%
5	Never	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 17,6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always encouraged themselves by telling themselves that they could do well and there is increase to be 61,8% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 18,2% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always encouraged themselves by telling themselves that they could do well and there is increase to be 30,3% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 52,9 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often encouraged themselves by telling themselves that they could do well and there is decrease to be 26,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 36,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often encouraged themselves by telling themselves that they could do well and there is increase to be 60,6% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 20,6% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes encouraged themselves by telling themselves that

they could do well and there is decrease to be 2,9% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 42,4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes encouraged themselves by telling themselves that they could do well and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 8,8% of respondents in experimental class seldom encouraged themselves by telling themselves that they could do well and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class seldom encouraged themselves by telling themselves that they could do well and there is increase to be 3,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in experimental class never encourage themselves by telling themselves that they can do well and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 0,0% of respondents in control class never encourage themselves by telling themselves that they can do well and it is still 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.26**

**The Students Think about How Learning to Write Will Help Them Succeeding  
In Their Other Courses**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	12	35.3%	1	3.0%	9	27.3%
2	Often	7	20.6%	15	44.1%	8	24.2%	16	48.5%
3	Sometimes	15	44.1%	7	20.6%	16	48.5%	6	18.2%
4	Seldom	10	29.4%	0	0.0%	7	21.2%	2	6.1%
5	Never	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always thought about how learning to write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is increase to be 35,3% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 3,0% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always thought about how learning to write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is increase to be 27,3% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 20,6 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often thought about how learning to write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is increase to be 44,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 24,2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often thought about how learning to write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is increase to be 48,5% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 44,1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes thought about how learning to



write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is decrease to be 20,6% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 48,5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes thought about how learning to write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is decrease to be 18,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 29,4% of respondents in experimental class seldom thought about how learning to write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 21,2% of respondents in control class seldom thought about how learning to write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is decrease to be 6,1% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 2,9% of respondents in experimental class never thought about how learning to write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 3,0% of respondents in control class never thought about how learning to write would help them succeed in their other courses and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

**Table IV.27****The Students Do Their Writing Assignment Fun for Themselves**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.9%	6	17.6%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%
2	Often	2	5.9%	16	47.1%	3	9.1%	13	39.4%
3	Sometimes	16	47.1%	10	29.4%	11	33.3%	6	18.2%
4	Seldom	12	35.3%	2	5.9%	13	39.4%	12	36.4%
5	Never	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	6	18.2%	1	3.0%
	TOTAL	34	100.0%	34	100.0%	33	100.0%	33	100.0%

It can be seen that in experimental class, 2,9% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is increase to be 17,6% of the respondents after the treatment. In control class, 0,0% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is increase to be 3,0% of the respondents after the treatment.

In experimental class, 5,9 % of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is increase to be 47,1% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 9,1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is increase to be 39,4% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Next, in experimental class, 47,1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is decrease to be 29,4% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. In control class, 33,3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire

sometimes did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is decrease to be 18,2% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

Then, before the treatment, 35,3% of respondents in experimental class seldom did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is decrease to be 5,9% of the respondents after the treatment. Before the treatment, 39,4% of respondents in control class seldom did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is decrease to be 36,4% of the respondents after the treatment.

Finally, before the treatment, 8,8% of respondents in experimental class never did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is decrease to be 0,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire. Before the treatment, 18,2% of respondents in control class never did their writing assignment fun for themselves and there is decrease to be 3,0% of the respondents in post-questionnaire.

## **C. Data Analysis**

### **1. Using Video in Teaching Writing**

Based on the result of the observation shown in table 4.1, the percentage of using video in teaching narrating writing for each category can be seen as follows:

- a. The teacher prepares the students to watch the video by tapping their background knowledge, stimulating interest in the topic, and lessening their fear of unfamiliar vocabulary (100%).
- b. The teacher requires students to focus on important aspects such as factual information, plot development, or the language used in a particular situation first (50%).
- c. The teacher primarily facilitates the actual viewing of video. They involve playing and replaying the entire sequence or relevant parts (100%).
- d. The teacher then will have students do a series of task that require them to concentrate on specific detail, such as sequence of events or a particular utterances used (75%).
- e. The teacher requires students to react to the video or to practice some particular language point. The range of post-viewing activities is enormous; in this term is writing activity (100%).

In addition, the result of observation percentage above is used to know if there were research activities which were well done and which were not well done.

The following table is the category of success of using the video in teaching narrative writing.

**Table IV.28**  
**Percentage Using Video in Teaching Narrative Writing**

NO	Result Observation	Frequency	Percentage
1	Yes	34	85%
2	No	6	15%

The Implementation of observation percentage of using video in teaching narrative writing is 85%. Therefore, it can be categorized that the using of video applied by the teacher as follows:<sup>1</sup>

**Table IV.29**  
**The Classification of Implementing Video in Teaching Narrative Writing**

No	Categories	Frequency	Score
1	Very Good	80%-100%	85%
2	Good	66%-79%	-
3	Enough	56%-65%	-
4	Less	40%-55%	-
5	Fail	30%-39%	-

## 2. Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text

---

<sup>1</sup>SuharsimiArikunto. *Dasar-dasarEvaluasiPendidikan.*,(Jakarta:BumiAksara. 2010), pp. 245

Regarding the Formulations of the problems, there are three questions that writer should find the answers. To find out the research findings, it is necessary to analyse and measure the gain of the score obtained from the pre questionnaire given before the treatment and post questionnaire given after the treatment. The following table presents the classification and percentage of the students' score:

**Table IV.30**

**The Classification of Student's Motivation in Writing Narrative Text Score**

NO	Categories	Score
1	Very strong	81% - 100%
2	Strong	61% - 80%
3	Enough	41% - 60%
4	Low	21% - 40%
5	Very low	0% - 20%

In finding the percentage, the writer used the following formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

**a. Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text Those Who Were Taught By Using Video**

Based on the result of the data analysis, the students' motivation in writing narrative text those who were taught by using video was STRONG. It can be seen as the following explanation:

**Table IV.31**

**The Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Textbefore Using Video in  
Experimental Class**

No	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	0	0.0%	9	26.5%	16	47.1%	9	26.5%	0	0.0%
2	1	2.9%	14	41.2%	12	35.3%	7	20.6%	0	0.0%
3	1	2.9%	16	47.1%	7	20.6%	9	26.5%	1	2.9%
4	1	2.9%	16	47.1%	11	32.4%	6	17.6%	0	0.0%
5	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	9	26.5%	19	55.9%	5	14.7%
7	4	11.8%	7	20.6%	8	23.5%	15	44.1%	0	0.0%
8	0	0.0%	15	44.1%	11	32.4%	7	20.6%	1	2.9%
9	0	0.0%	5	14.7%	10	29.4%	17	50.0%	2	5.9%
10	1	2.9%	3	8.8%	11	32.4%	19	55.9%	0	0.0%
11	0	0.0%	2	5.9%	5	14.7%	23	67.6%	4	11.8%
12	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	2	5.9%	27	79.4%	4	11.8%
13	1	2.9%	8	23.5%	9	26.5%	14	41.2%	2	5.9%
14	0	0.0%	2	5.9%	9	26.5%	20	58.8%	3	8.8%
15	1	2.9%	6	17.6%	13	37.3%	14	41.2%	0	0.0%
16	0	0.0%	2	5.9%	3	8.8%	24	70.6%	5	14.7%
17	1	2.9%	3	8.8%	5	14.7%	23	67.6%	2	5.9%
18	8	23.5%	21	61.8%	5	14.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
19	2	5.9%	18	52.9%	10	29.4%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%
20	1	2.9%	5	14.7%	11	32.4%	14	41.2%	3	8.8%
22	4	11.8%	18	52.9%	10	29.4%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%
24	1	2.9%	16	47.1%	10	29.4%	6	17.6%	1	2.9%
25	2	5.9%	17	50.0%	9	26.5%	6	17.6%	0	0.0%
26	2	5.9%	21	61.8%	7	20.6%	3	8.8%	1	2.9%
28	6	17.6%	18	52.9%	5	14.7%	5	14.7%	0	0.0%
29	1	2.9%	7	20.6%	15	44.1%	10	29.4%	1	2.9%
30	1	2.9%	2	5.9%	16	47.1%	12	35.3%	3	8.8%
total	39		253		239		315		38	

From the table above, the obtained data were then computed by the following calculation to obtain the score as well as its percentage:

$$P = \frac{2557}{4420} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 57.85\%$$

From the percentage above, it can be concluded that the students' motivation in writing narrative text before using video was **enough**.

**Table IV.32**



**The Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text after Using Video in  
Experimental Class**

No	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	14	41.2%	16	47.1%	1	2.9%	1	2.9%	2	5.9%
2	19	55.9%	12	35.3%	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	17	50.0%	14	41.2%	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	12	35.3%	17	50.0%	4	11.8%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%
5	3	8.8%	16	47.1%	8	23.5%	5	14.7%	2	5.9%
7	20	58.8%	12	35.3%	1	2.9%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%
8	13	38.2%	17	50.0%	3	8.8%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%
9	6	17.6%	17	50.0%	8	23.5%	3	8.8%	0	0.0%
10	5	14.7%	17	50.0%	5	14.7%	7	20.6%	0	0.0%
11	4	11.8%	14	41.2%	8	23.5%	7	20.6%	1	2.9%
12	1	2.9%	13	38.2%	12	35.3%	7	20.6%	1	2.9%
13	7	20.6%	18	52.9%	7	20.6%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%
14	4	11.8%	18	52.9%	7	20.6%	4	11.8%	1	2.9%
15	7	20.6%	12	35.3%	6	13.0%	8	23.5%	1	2.9%
16	1	2.9%	13	38.2%	13	38.2%	7	20.6%	0	0.0%
17	3	8.8%	5	14.7%	9	26.5%	14	41.2%	3	8.8%
18	21	61.8%	13	38.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
19	19	55.9%	11	32.4%	3	8.8%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%
20	11	32.4%	13	38.2%	9	26.5%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%
22	19	55.9%	10	29.4%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%
24	15	44.1%	17	50.0%	1	2.9%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%
25	18	52.9%	13	38.2%	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
26	21	61.8%	11	32.4%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%
28	21	61.8%	9	26.5%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
29	12	35.3%	15	44.1%	7	20.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
30	6	17.6%	16	47.1%	10	29.4%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%
total	299		359		140		73		13	

From the table above, the obtained data were then computed by the following calculation to obtain the score as well as its percentage:

$$P = \frac{3510}{4420} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 79,41\%$$

From the percentage above, it can be concluded that the students' motivation in writing narrative text before using video was **strong**.

**b. Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text Those Who Were Taught By Using Video**

Based on the result of the data analysis, the students' motivation in writing narrative text those who were taught without using video was STRONG. It can be seen as the following explanation:

**Table IV.33**

**The Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text in Pre-Questionnaire of Control Class**

No	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	0	0.0%	5	15.2%	5	15.2%	21	63.6%	2	6.1%
2	4	12.1%	21	63.6%	3	9.1%	5	15.2%	0	0.0%
3	2	6.1%	13	39.4%	8	24.2%	9	27.3%	1	3.0%
4	5	15.2%	13	39.4%	7	21.2%	6	18.2%	2	6.1%
5	1	3.0%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%	23	69.7%	7	21.2%
7	5	15.2%	18	54.5%	5	15.2%	5	15.2%	0	0.0%
8	3	9.1%	12	36.4%	13	39.4%	5	15.2%	0	0.0%
9	1	3.0%	7	21.2%	8	24.2%	16	48.5%	1	3.0%
10	1	3.0%	10	30.3%	4	12.1%	16	48.5%	2	6.1%
11	0	0.0%	2	6.1%	4	12.1%	23	69.7%	4	12.1%
12	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	6.1%	26	78.8%	5	15.2%
13	2	6.1%	7	21.2%	13	39.4%	11	33.3%	0	0.0%
14	0	0.0%	8	24.2%	5	15.2%	18	54.5%	2	6.1%
15	2	6.1%	7	21.2%	17	51.5%	7	21.2%	0	0.0%
16	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	28	84.8%	4	12.1%
17	0	0.0%	3	9.1%	7	21.2%	19	57.6%	4	12.1%
18	10	30.3%	19	57.6%	4	12.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
19	5	15.2%	12	36.4%	14	42.4%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
20	0	0.0%	9	27.3%	14	42.4%	10	30.3%	0	0.0%
22	4	12.1%	19	57.6%	8	24.2%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
24	1	3.0%	5	15.2%	15	45.5%	11	33.3%	1	3.0%
25	4	12.1%	16	48.5%	9	27.3%	4	12.1%	0	0.0%
26	4	12.1%	15	45.5%	14	42.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
28	6	18.2%	12	36.4%	11	33.3%	4	12.1%	0	0.0%
29	1	3.0%	8	24.2%	16	48.5%	7	21.2%	1	3.0%
30	0	0.0%	3	9.1%	11	33.3%	13	39.4%	6	18.2%
total	61		247		217		291		42	

From the table above, the obtained data were then computed by the following calculation to obtain the score as well as its percentage:

$$P = \frac{2532}{4420} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 59,02\%$$

From the percentage above, it can be concluded that the students' motivation in writing narrative text in pre questionnaire was **enough**.

**Table IV.34**

**The Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text in Post-Questionnaire of  
Control Class**

No	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	2	6.1%	22	66.7%	2	6.1%	7	21.2%	0	0.0%
2	15	45.5%	18	54.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	6	18.2%	20	60.6%	3	9.1%	4	12.1%	0	0.0%
4	14	42.4%	14	42.4%	1	3.0%	4	12.1%	0	0.0%
5	1	3.0%	9	27.3%	8	24.2%	13	39.4%	2	6.1%
7	7	21.2%	23	69.7%	3	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	8	24.2%	21	63.6%	2	6.1%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
9	4	12.1%	11	33.3%	6	18.2%	12	36.4%	0	0.0%
10	1	3.0%	16	48.5%	8	24.2%	8	24.2%	0	0.0%
11	0	0.0%	10	30.3%	6	18.2%	16	48.5%	1	3.0%
12	0	0.0%	8	24.2%	5	15.2%	18	54.5%	2	6.1%
13	6	18.2%	15	45.5%	3	9.1%	8	24.2%	1	3.0%
14	3	9.1%	12	36.4%	6	18.2%	10	30.3%	2	6.1%
15	3	9.1%	17	51.5%	7	21.2%	5	15.2%	1	3.0%
16	0	0.0%	6	18.2%	7	21.2%	17	51.5%	3	9.1%
17	1	3.0%	9	27.3%	5	15.2%	16	48.5%	2	6.1%
18	19	57.6%	14	42.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
19	13	39.4%	19	57.6%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20	5	15.2%	19	57.6%	3	9.1%	6	18.2%	0	0.0%
22	11	33.3%	21	63.6%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%
24	5	15.2%	17	51.5%	2	6.1%	8	24.2%	1	3.0%
25	9	27.3%	22	66.7%	1	3.0%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%
26	7	21.2%	23	69.7%	1	3.0%	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
28	10	30.3%	20	60.6%	1	3.0%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
29	9	27.3%	16	48.5%	6	18.2%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
30	1	3.0%	13	39.4%	6	18.2%	12	36.4%	1	3.0%
total	160		415		93		173		17	

From the table above, the obtained data were then computed by the following calculation to obtain the score as well as its percentage:

$$P = \frac{3086}{4420} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 71,93\%$$

From the percentage above, it can be concluded that the students' motivation in writing narrative text in post questionnaire was **strong**.

**c. The Significant Effect of Using Video towards Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text**

Based on the result of the data analysis, YES, there is significant effect of using video toward students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency. It can be seen as the following explanation:

**TableIV. 35**

**Students' Motivation in Writing Narrative Text in Experimental Class and Control Class**

STUDENTS	EXPERIMENT		GAIN	STUDENTS	CONTROL		GAIN
	PRE	POST			PRE	POST	
1	59,23	94,62	35,39	1	56,92	65,38	8,46
2	78,46	92,31	13,85	2	53,85	71,54	17,69
3	70	73,08	3,08	3	53,85	77,69	23,84
4	56,15	89,23	33,08	4	85,38	69,23	-16,15
5	74,62	80,77	6,15	5	54,62	66,15	11,53
6	70,77	80,77	10	6	69,23	80,77	11,54
7	57,69	80	22,31	7	63,08	61,54	-1,54
8	63,08	72,31	9,23	8	56,15	61,54	5,39
9	60,77	71,54	10,77	9	56,15	67,69	11,54
10	46,92	73,85	26,93	10	56,15	81,54	25,39
11	73,08	87,69	14,61	11	64,62	68,46	3,84
12	55,38	89,23	33,85	12	56,92	81,54	24,62
13	57,69	70,77	13,08	13	61,54	65,38	3,84
14	54,62	90,77	36,15	14	71,54	85,38	13,84
15	56,92	81,54	24,62	15	65,38	80	14,62
16	64,62	82,31	17,69	16	53,85	66,15	12,3
17	59,23	76,92	17,69	17	60	80,77	20,77
18	56,15	68,46	12,31	18	56,15	76,92	20,77
19	60	76,15	16,15	19	71,54	80,77	9,23
20	73,08	80	6,92	20	53,08	70,77	17,69
21	60	81,54	21,54	21	53,85	54,62	0,77
22	56,92	89,23	32,31	22	73,08	89,23	16,15
23	48,46	85,38	36,92	23	49,23	60	10,77
24	53,08	54,62	1,54	24	56,92	76,15	19,23
25	59,23	76,92	17,69	25	56,15	76,92	20,77
26	50	84,62	34,62	26	52,31	70,77	18,46
27	57,69	62,31	4,62	27	53,85	59,23	5,38
28	53,85	87,69	33,84	28	77,69	80	2,31
29	50	80,77	30,77	29	47,69	63,85	16,16
30	51,54	85,38	33,84	30	53,85	86,92	33,07
31	56,92	86,15	29,23	31	60	73,85	13,85
32	48,46	65,38	16,92	32	66,92	71,54	4,62
33	56,15	75,38	19,23	33	53,85	64,62	10,77
34	58,46	75,38	16,92				
TOTAL	2009,22	2703,07	693,85	TOTAL	1975,39	2386,91	411,52
MEAN	59,09	79,50	20,41	MEAN	59,86	72,33	12,47

Based on the table above, it is clear that students' motivation in writing narrative text in experimental class was higher than the students' in control class. It can be seen by the computation that 20, 41 is higher than 12, 47 ( $26,53 > 16,21$ ).

To analyse the data, the writer should find the way to get the score or the interval data of the dependent variable. As what was used by the previous researchers, the way to get the interval data of the dependent variable is by counting the gain score of the total score obtained from the likert scale in both pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire. In addition, the mean was obtained by computing the gain score. Based on that reason, the writer interpreted that the gain score is similar to score (X) in a normal data distribution.

Thus, by using Microsoft Excel, t-Test computation can be seen as follows:

**Table IV. 36**

**Resume of t-Test**

Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental	34	20,41	10, 899
Control	33	12,47	9, 434

The computation can be described as the following steps:

- a) Computing the value of  $t_0$  is as follows:



$$t_0 = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{20,41 - 12,47}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{10,899}{\sqrt{34-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{9,434}{\sqrt{33-1}}\right)^2}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{7,94}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{10,899}{5,74}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{9,434}{5,66}\right)^2}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{7,94}{\sqrt{(1,90)^2 + (1,67)^2}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{7,94}{\sqrt{3,61 + 2,79}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{7,94}{\sqrt{6,40}}$$

$$t_0 = \frac{7,94}{2,53}$$

$$t_0 = 3,14$$

b) Interpreting  $t_0$  is as follows:

$$df = N_x + N_y - 2 = 34 + 33 - 2 = 65$$

$df = 65$ , in the level of significance  $5\% = 2,00$

in the level of significance  $1\% = 2,65$

With the following hypotheses:

If  $t_o \leq t_t$ :  $H_o$  is accepted and  $H_a$  is rejected

If  $t_o > t_t$ :  $H_o$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted

Based on the analysis above,  $t_o$  is 3,14 in which it is higher than  $t_t$  on the level of significance  $5\% = 2,00$  and  $1\% = 2,65$ . It means that  $H_o$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. It can be concluded that there is significant effect of using video towards students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this chapter, there are two main parts of the research called conclusion and suggestions. The conclusion was meant to research finding and the suggestions were intended for the pedagogical implication and some suggestions from the future research.

#### A. Conclusion

Based on the data obtained, there are three research findings of this study that were elaborated as follows:

1. The class which was taught by using video (experimental class), it can be clearly seen that before the treatment, the student' motivation in writing narrative text can be categorized as *enough* (57.85%). After the treatment, the students' motivation in writing narrative text increased to be *strong* (79,41%). Based on the percentage, in can be interpreted that the students' motivation in writing narrative text those who were taught by using video (experimental class) highly increases as much as 21, 56 %.
2. The class which was taught without using video (control class), it can be clearly seen that before the treatment, the student' motivation in writing narrative text can be categorized as *enough* (59,02%). After the treatment,

the students' motivation in writing narrative text increased to be *strong* (71,93%). Based on the percentage, it can be interpreted that the students' motivation in writing narrative text those who were taught without using video (experimental class) highly enough increases as much as 12,91 %.

3. Based on the analysis of the data by using t-Test, it was obtained that  $t_o$  is 3,14 in which it is higher than  $t_t$  on the level of significance  $5\% = 2,00$  and  $1\% = 2,65$ . It means that  $H_o$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. It can be concluded that there is significant effect of using video towards students' motivation in writing narrative text at the second year of State Islamic Senior High School Tembilahan Indragiri Hilir Regency.

## **B. Suggestions**

Based on the previous elaboration, several suggestions were proposed that hopefully may be useful for the teacher of English subject and the further study which has the similar area with this study either in using video or in students' writing motivation; the suggestions are as follows:

1. The writer suggests so much to the teacher of English subject to use video in teaching English because it is very interesting medium to motivate, to stimulate, and to pay the students' attention in learning English.

2. The writer suggests the English teacher to use the video in teaching because this kind of teaching medium is not only good to improve students' motivation in writing, but also their writing, speaking, and listening ability.
3. Finally, the writer suggests the English teacher to ensure the good time management and well-preparation in using this medium since using video in the class needs much time allocation.

## References

- Aiex, and Nola Kortner. "Using film, video, and TV in the classroom". Eric Digest. 1988. <http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-929/film.htm>. Retrieved 29 April 2012.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2010. *Dasar-dasarEvaluasiPendidikan*. Jakarta: BumiAksara.
- Arikunto,Suharsimi. 2006. *ProsedurPenelitian; SuatuPendekatanPraktik*. Jakarta: PT. AsdiMahasatya.
- Bossewitch, Jonah, and Michael D. Preston. "Teaching and Learning with Video Annotation". *Learning Through Digital Media Experiments in Pedagogy and Technology*, 8 March 2011. <http://learningthroughdigitalmedia.net/teaching-and-learning-with-video-annotations>. Retrieved 6 May 2011.
- Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi Experimental Designs for Research*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Creswell, John W. 2008. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitive and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Dakhal,Rebat Kumar. 2010. *Students Motivation Toward Creative Writing*. Lalitpur: Katamandu.
- Davis, Randal S. "Captioned Video, Make It Work for You". *The Internet TESL Journal.*, 3 March 1998. <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Davis-CaptionedVideo/>. Retrieved 29 April 2011.
- Di Mele, Luciano. "Teaching Media in School: Observing and Monitoring". 6 May 2011. <http://www.gabinetecomunicacionyeducacion.com/files/adjuntos/Teaching%20media%20in%20school%20observing%20and%20monitoring.pdf>. Retrieved 29 April 2012.
- "Effect". 2012. Wikipedia.com. Retrieved 29 April 2012.
- Gay, L.R., and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

- Hasibuan, Kalayo. 2006. *Teaching Media*. Pekanbaru: UIN SUSKA.
- Hughey, Jane B., et. al. 1983. *Teaching ESL Composition Principles and Techniques*. Massachussetts: Newbury House Publisher.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2002. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Longman.
- Hartono. 2009. *Statistik Untuk Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Hartono, Rudi. "Genre-based Writing". *How to Teach Text types*. 2008..  
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/38928455/>. Retrieved March 28<sup>th</sup> 2008.
- Hasibuan, Kalayo, and Muhammad Fauzan Anshari. 2007. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press. .
- Hermadaliza. 2009. *The Use of Audiovisual (VCD/DVD) to Increase Students' Interest in Learning English at the Second Year of MTs AL-Wathan Rupert*. Pekanbaru: UIN SUSKA.
- Hidi, Suzanne, and Pietro Boscolo. 2007. *Writing and Motivation*. Oxford: ELSEVIER.
- Jones, Brent A. "Critical Thinking What a character", *The Internet TESL Journal*. 9 September 2004. <http://iteslj.org/Lessons/Jones-Character.html>. 29 April 2011.
- Katchen, Johanna E. "Video in ELT". 2002.  
<http://mx.nthu.edu.tw/~katchen/professional/KATE%20paper.htm>. Retrieved 29 April 2011.
- Lile, William.T. "Motivation in the ESL classroom". *The Internet TESL Journal*. 1 Jan 2002. <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Lile-Motivation.html>. 29 April 2012.
- Nunan, David. 1989. *Designing Task for Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nur'aviyah. 2011. *Silabus Bahasa Inggris KTSP MAN Tembilahan*. Tembilahan: MAN Tembilahan.

- Oshima, Alice, and Ann Hogue. 2007. *Introduction to Academic Writing (3rd Edition)*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Peha, Steve. "The Writing Teacher's Strategy Guide", *Teaching That Makes Sense*, 1995-2010, 6 May 2011, [www.ttms.org](http://www.ttms.org).
- Qashoa, Sulaiman Hasan H. 2006. *Motivation among Learner of English in the Secondary School in the Easter Cost of the UAE*. Dubai: British University in Dubai.
- Reid, Joy M. 1988. *The Process of Composition*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Richard, Jack C., and Willy A. Renandya. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riduwan. 2005. *Variable-variable Penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sudarwati, Th M, and Eudia Grace. 2006. *Look Ahead 2*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Stempleski, Susan and Barry Tomalin. *Video in Action*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Setiyadi, Bambang. *Metode Penelitian dan Pengajaran Bahasa Asing*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Savage, Alice and Patricia Mayer. 2005. *Effective Academic Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- S, M. Syafii. 2011. *From Paragraph to a Research Report*. Pekanbaru: LBSI, 2011.
- Smith, Tony. 2004. *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tatsuki, Donna Hurst. "Narrating in Simple Past with Video". *The Internet TESL Journal*. 3 March 1998. <http://iteslj.org/Lessons/Tatsuki-Movie/SimplePast.html>. 29 April 2011.
- "Teaching with video". *Learning to Teach, Teaching to Learn*. 6 May 2011. <http://www.cdtl.nus.edu.sg/handbook/media/video.htm>. Retrieved 29 April 2011.
- Woldkowski, J, Raymond, and Margery B Ginsberg. 2010. *Teaching Intensive and Accelerated Courses*. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass.



Wolf, Grant S. "Using Video to Develop Writing Fluency in Low-Proficiency ESL Students" *The Internet TESL Journal*. August 2006.<http://iteslj.org>. Retrieved 24 March 2011.

Wilson, Christine Canning. "Practical Aspects of Using Video in the Foreign Language Classroom". *The Internet TESL Journal*. 11 November 2000 <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Canning-Video.html>. Retrieved 29 April 2012.